The Nation

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1915.

Summary of the News

The President returned from Cornish, N. H., to Washington on Monday and held a conference with Secretary Lansing on the subject of the note to Germany. On Tuesday it is understood that a draft of the note was presented to the Cabinet for consideration. No official intimation has, as we write, been given as to the date of the dispatch of the note to Germany, but it is generally supposed that it will not in any event be delayed for many days.

Diplomatic communications and statements have been more numerous perhaps during the past week than in any similar period of time since the end of July, last year, when Germany was scattering ultimatums through Europe. The most welcome of these, so far as the United States is concerned, was that received on July 15, when Ambassador Gerard formally transmitted to the State Department an admission on the part of Germany of liability and an expression of regret for the attack on the American steamship Nebraskan on May 25. The German note absolves the commander of the submarine from blame on the ground that, when attacked, the vessel carried no flag and no neutral markings on her freeboard, and that in the twilight her name was not visible.

On the same day that the note on the subject of the Nebraskan was received it became known that, on June 29, the Austro-Hungarian Minister of Foreign Affairs had presented to the American Ambassador at Vienna a note on the question of the export of munitions from this country to the Allies, in which it was politely suggested that, if only the United States realized that this proceeding was "not in consonance with the definition of neutrality," the traffic would be stopped. The Austrian Government, therefore, considerately points out that the American Government "is undoubtedly entitled to prohibit the export of war material." No reply has as yet been sent to this note, and it is thought that none will be prepared until the full text of the communication has been received by mail, when the expressions of good-will towards the United States contained in the note will doubtless be cordially reciprocated.

The long-expected note to England on the general subject of interference with American commerce on the high seas has not yet gone forward, but preliminary communications have been sent. On July 14, Ambassador Page was instructed to make representations to the British Government on behalf of the packers in the matter of the detention of their meat products, and at the same time formal notice was given to Great Britain, through the American Ambassador, that the United States holds that the rights of Americans, who have cases before British Prize Courts, rest upon international law and not upon British municipal law or Orders in Council. The official summary of Secretary Lansing's communication to this effect was published in Sunday's papers. Dispatches from Washington surmise that the forthcoming note to the British Government on the general question of the operation of the Order in Council will draw attention to the fact that the blockade maintained is discriminatory, in that it cuts off American trade with Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, while at the same time Baltic ports of Germany are open for trade with the Scandinavian countries.

Three reports bearing on various aspects of the war have been published during the past week by, respectively, Austria, Germany, and Great Britain. A summary of the Austrian Red Book, bearing the title "Collection of Evidence," was printed in the papers of July 16. In it, all of the Allies are accused of numerous atrocities, varying in kind, though hardly in degree, which, it is alleged, have been perpetrated against Austrian troops or civilians. Sunday's papers contained a summary of the German Government's reply to the findings of Lord Bryce's Commission on German atrocities in Belgium. Elsewhere we comment briefly on this document, the essence of which is a repetition of the defence that the Belgians brought all their woes upon themselves by unorganized resistance to German arms. The findings of the Court of Inquiry into the loss of the Lusitania, under the presidency of Lord Mersey, were published in dispatches of July 17. The court exonerated the captain and the Cunard Line of all blame and placed the entire responsibility on the German submarine. It also found that the ship was unarmed, that her cargo was a general one, and that the ammunition on board consisted only of 5,000 cases of cartridges, from which there was no explosion.

The most notable incident of the German submarine blockade during the past few days was the report brought in by the Cunard liner Orduna, when she docked in New York on Saturday, that, on July 9, when westward bound, she was attacked without warning by a submarine. According to the official statement of the captain, the first intimation received of the attack was when the lookout men saw a torpedo pass some feet from the stern. Subsequently the submarine rose to the surface and shelled the liner, without effect. The incident has been brought to the official attention of Washington by some of the American passengers on the Orduna.

Apart from the exploit noted above, the only activity of submarines recorded since we wrote last week has been the sinking of a Norwegian vessel and a Russian collier, and the holding up and jettisoning of the cargo of a second Norwegian ship. The moderation displayed in the last instance, when the ship was allowed to proceed on her way after the cargo had been thrown overboard, we may hope is further indication that a change of tactics in the use of submarines is contemplated in practice, though not as yet officially admitted. We have to correct the report which we recorded last week that a German submarine had compelled the American bark Normandy to act as a screen while the submarine made ready to attack another vessel. A denial of the report has been cabled to the State Department by the American Consul at Liverpool. The German report on the results of its submarine operations during the month of June was given out in a dispatch by the Overseas News Agency, under date of July 14. That submarine enterprise is not confined to one nation was indicated by dispatches in Saturday's papers, which stated that Russian submarines have been exceptionally busy in the Black Sea, having sunk recently a number of Turkish vessels.

The most serious strike that has occurred in Britain since the war began has taken place among the miners of South Wales. The men refused to accept a compromise recommended by the leaders of their union after consultation with the Board of Trade, and decided to strike. Their determination was unaffected by the announcement that the provisions of the Munitions of War act would be applied to their case. As, however, nearly 200,000 miners are affected, it is obvious that the difficulty of enforcing these provisions would be considerable. Dispatches on Tuesday stated that the strike had been settled through the mediation of Mr. Lloyd George and that work would probably be resumed to-day.

A bad strike was also started last week in the plant of the Remington Arms Company, at Bridgeport, Conn. The origins and occasion of the strike appear somewhat mysterious, but it has been attributed, both by the manager of the company and by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, to foreign intrigue, having as its motive the stoppage of supplies of munitions to the Allies. As we write, prospects of a settlement of the strike are not hopeful, and it is feared that it may be extended throughout the works of New England which are engaged in the manufacture of munitions. The British Ambassador on Monday called the attention of the State Department to a number of instances in which it was alleged that German sympathizers in the United States were employing unlawful means to strike at Great Britain and her Allies. The complaints will be investigated by the Department of Justice.

At a meeting of 186 members of the Greek Chamber of Deputies on Monday, M. Venizelos accepted anew the leadership of the Liberal party. The reopening of the Greek Parliament has been postponed until August 16.

The importance of the position of Rumania has been further emphasized by various reports during the past few days. Austrian offers of territory, which we recorded last week, it was stated in dispatches on Saturday, have been rejected, and it is reported that the Teutonic allies are about to bring strong pressure to bear on Rumania to induce her to facilitate the passage through her territory of munitions for Turkey.

Harry K. Thaw, who killed Stanford White in 1906 and was acquitted of murder on the ground of insanity, was declared sane by Supreme Court Justice Hendrick, of New York, on July 16. In forming his decision Justice Hendrick was assisted by a jury.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week

The reception that Herr von Jagow's last note on the Lusitania question has met with in America has, according to all reports from Berlin, put the German mind into a condition of plaintive surprise. It seems impossible, says one Berlin newspaper after another, that Germany's great liberality and friendliness should not be welcomed with appreciation and pleasure. "The *Tageszeitung* declares," says a cablegram to the *Times*, "that American politicians must appreciate that the German propositions are practical and that Germany on her own initiative has made extraordinary concessions." What America wants, however, is not "extraordinary concessions" made by Germany on her own initiative, but ordinary concessions made in pursuance of *our* initiative. This idea does not seem to occur to the German mind at all—the idea that when we ask for the exercise of an unquestionable right we are not content to take something else, which they assure us is just as good. That sort of thing may be extremely "practical" in ordinary dickerings involving no question of principle; but in this case the principle is everything. Indeed, the initiative of the German Government has been so extraordinary, and its schemes for giving licenses to American ships so ingenious, that it is hard to see why they did not go a step further, and offer to pay Americans who desired to cross the ocean a reasonable compensation for staying at home. Doubtless a perfectly "practical" method might have been devised for assessing the rates of payment.

The apology by the German Government for the torpedoing of the Nebraskan, with promise of full reparation for the damage done, satisfactorily disposes of that incident. There is, to be sure, no concession by Germany of the principle involved. She still seems to think it lawful to sink an enemy passenger ship without warning or inquiry. This the United States Government has denied. But so far as the Nebraskan itself was concerned, Germany has done all that could have been asked. She apologizes and will pay. She did the same, early in June, in the case of the Gulflight. This illustrates a neat point in German diplomatic tactics. A general note is written, unyielding and unsatisfactory, but it is followed up in a few days with a specific note, dealing with an individual case, which is as gracious as could be imagined. That was done after the first German reply in the matter of the Lusitania, and it is now done after the second. It all has an odd look, as if Wilhelmstrasse were surprised to learn that its answers displeased America, and hastily sent along something else which it was sure would please us mightily. A truer explanation would doubtless be the desire not to offend German public opinion on the main issue between the two countries. Either way, the German Government has made an end of the myth, long dear to so many, that it was deliberately seeking to get into a war with the United States.

"The American grievance against Germany for its treatment of Belgium," says Dr. Meyer-Gerhard to his countrymen, "the average German can scarcely understand, for he knows that Belgium long ago had surrendered her neutrality by an agreement with Germany's enemies." But the average American has every bit as much opportunity as the average German to "know" the truth about Belgian neutrality, and no subject has engaged more earnest or more prolonged attention among those Americans who are the leaders of opinion in this country. And with an almost complete unanimity they reject as worthless—and worse than worthless—the pitiful bits of so-called evidence that Germany has put forward to sustain her accusation of perfidy against that country upon which the German Chancellor himself, at the beginning of the war, publicly confessed that Germany was about to perpetrate a crime justified only by the doctrine of military necessity. Nothing in the German attitude has been more offensive than the constant complacent assertion of the notion that what Americans think about the war is sure to be due to ignorance when it does not agree with what Germans "know" about it.

"Right on the heels of the outbreak of the present war," says the opening sentence of the German reply to the Bryce report, "a turbulent insurrection broke forth in Belgium against the German troops. This was in flagrant violation of international law, and brought the heaviest penalties on the Belgian land and people." Coming from the German Government, so totally guiltless itself of any violation of international law, this accusation against the Belgian people will carry crushing weight. Of course, if the Belgians had risen against an arrogant and lawless invader, who had trampled under foot his own solemn treaty promises—who, after guaranteeing the safety of Belgium from such invasion, had himself shamelessly, upon two days' notice, sent his numberless legions into the country—if that had been so, there might have been some excuse for "a turbulent insurrection" even if it were more or less in "violation of international law." But resistance to German aggression—aggression which could not have been in violation of international law, because Germany's rights are well known to be exempt from the obligations of the law—what words can do justice to this inhuman wickedness of the Belgians?

With the German campaign against the Russian armies again displaying enormous power, it is important to bear in mind its real objective. This is not the capture of Riga or even of Warsaw. Both of those cities might fall to German arms, and the Russians be driven far back, without the attaining by the German General Staff of the end for which it is striving, and which alone would pay an adequate price for the great exertion and the enormous losses entailed. The enveloping movement which Hindenburg and Mackensen are now apparently pressing has the military design of catching the Russian armies between the German wings, and of breaking them up by a series of heavy defeats and the taking of vast numbers of prisoners, so that their offensive power will be broken for a long time to come. That is the true military objective. Short of it an impressive advance may, it is true, be scored and moral victories won; the fall of Warsaw, for example, would be a great blow to the hopes of Russia and the Allies. But if the Russian troops retreated as intact as they did from Przemysl and Lemberg, and were able to maintain their morale, the great purpose of the campaign would have been frustrated.

Austria has undoubtedly been a splendid ally for Germany. She has done things for her that she would not have done for herself. In the matter of the concessions offered to Italy, for example, the German Chancellor explained that they had been made uncommonly generous by Austria at Germany's request. And now Vienna comes forward again to do Berlin a favor. It is in the form of a note by the Austrian Government to our Department of State, objecting to the sale of American munitions of war to the Allies. The reasons why Germany preferred to "let Austria do it" are plain. In the first place, the German Government, on December 15, informed the American Secretary of State that "under the general prin-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciples of international law, no exception can be taken to neutral states letting war material go to Germany's enemies." It would be a bit awkward to repudiate that now. Furthermore, when Ambassador Bernstorff undertook last April, on his own initiative, to protest against the "enormous new industry of war materials" in this country, and to make the impudent suggestion that "the American people" should "find means to stop the exclusive exportation of arms to one side," he got his quietus from the President. Mr. Wilson informed him that the sale of munitions was perfectly legal, and that this Government held that "any change in its own laws of neutrality, during the progress of a war, which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war, would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality." The President added that "an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time" would be "a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States." No wonder that Germany, after having the door thus shut in her face, should request Austria to be the one to knock at it next. After Austria has got the same answer, it is reported that German diplomacy will get Turkey to try it on! What are allies for except to get slapped in the face?

No one believes that the Progressives any longer form a party of definitely independent aims and organization; but it is something to have Colonel Roosevelt's clear-cut admission that they are again a branch of Republicanism, certain to revolt sharply if reactionary voices prevail in the old party, certain to lose their individuality if a spirit akin to their own is dominant. Under a man like Hughes, he told an Oregon audience on Monday, "our progressive idea" would be safe. But if a reactionary were nominated, "the Progressive Party would be an imperative need to the country." Considering the Colonel's violent lashing-out against men who are trying to talk for him in politics, this has a considerable resemblance to William Allen White's recent statement as to the future of Progressivism. It is only more moderate, more friendly to the much-denounced party of 1912! It is becoming clear that the Colonel would a great deal rather have a forward-looking Republican nominated, and party unity restored, than be put to the necessity of sulking outside the camp or of carrying on a heated rival campaign. A day before entering the political domain of the ultra-ambitious Gov. Johnson he dares hint at the absorption of the party. And it is to be noted that he predicts nothing as to the Progressives' course if the Republicans do choose a "reactionary." Mr. White left it to be understood that two million voters would then seriously contemplate voting with the Democrats. Is it not possible that, in the Colonel's phrase, many would thus think they were "exerting an influence to be counted on for the best good of the country"?

Announcement that five yards on the Delaware River are now building forty-six ocean-going vessels, with reports of a like activity in New England yards, indicates that one of the strongest reasons for a modification of the La Follette act is fast growing stronger. The producing capacity of American shipbuilders is increasing with every month of the war. Marine journals state that whereas the average cost of making a vessel in Great Britain was $40 a ton, it is now $60, and that the output of British yards is curtailed by the necessity of doing forced work for the navy. Difficulties of exportation, at the same time, have checked the old tendency of our steel-plate manufacturers to sell more cheaply abroad than at home. The American industry is, of course, building for the future as well as the present, for the demand for ships after the restoration of peace will be acute. Operators can now sail their vessels on the Atlantic at a profit even under the oppressive Seamen's law; when the war is over and the freight-rates drop, they can sell them to advantage. But it will be the grossest national mismanagement if we fail to conserve the enlarged and economical shipbuilding capacity developed by our yards, with every means in our power. The one certain guarantee of its maintenance is a prosperous American marine. England before the war was evidence of the fact that shipbuilders may do business for many foreign countries; but the mainstay of our yards will have to be our own mercantile navy.

The memorandum presented by the Civil Service Reform Association to the delegates to the Constitutional Convention of New York puts in remarkably compact and effective form the story of the establishment of the merit system in this State, the proof furnished by experience of the benefit of the Constitutional safeguard now existing for its continued integrity, the considerations relating to certain questions as to its extension and improvement, and the objections to any weakening of its principle by the creation of preferred classes, other than that consisting of veterans of the Civil War. The exemption of those veterans from the requirement of competitive standing is itself, as the Association says, "not in accordance with the true principles of civil service reform"; but it was made in recognition of a most extraordinary claim on the nation's gratitude, and furthermore was a recognition of a preference actually enjoyed before the introduction of the merit system, so that the provision for it under that system might be regarded as simply continuing an existing privilege. To institute such a privilege now for veterans of the Spanish War or other minor wars, or for the militia or volunteer firemen, would be to introduce a dangerous weakness in what ought to be a system built upon the clear principle of securing for every post the best man that can be obtained to fill it. To any fitting reward of men who have served the State or the country in posts of danger, there can be no objection; but, as the Association puts it, "it cannot be called a fitting reward of patriotic service to grant to those who have rendered military service the privilege of impairing the civil service."

The proposal to abolish the "emergency message," brought up in the New York Constitutional Convention, suggests interesting reflections. The emergency message is designed to cure the evils arising from those restrictions upon the power of the Legislature which are established in order to cure the evils arising from rushing legislation through without due consideration. Mr. Austin's amendment is designed to cure the evils arising from the cure of the cure. "I know of no emergency," he says, "that has justified its use [the use of the emergency message] since it received Constitutional sanction twenty years ago." Others will not admit the correctness of Mr. Austin's observation; indeed, we do not believe it would be difficult to point to a number of important instances in which resort to the emergency message has been distinctly called for in the public interest. On the other hand, it has unquestionably been employed in cases in which its application could not possibly be justified upon any general principle—in other words, the power has been abused by being placed at the service of "politics" and not of the real needs of the State. What is wanted is such reform in the methods of legislation as would avoid the evils of congested calendars, and rushes at the end of a session, and snap votes; but whether that reform can be ob-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tained by any Constitutional rule, and if so, how—that is the question. The other way would be to have better Legislatures, and better Governors, than we are usually fortunate enough to get—and how to do that is quite as hard a question.

The Wisconsin Senate has amended the bill to give the Governor complete control of the State University. The bill provided for a Central Board of fifteen, appointed by the Governor, and committed to their hands the entire charge of the educational system of the State. The amendment leaves the Central Board, but allows it financial jurisdiction only, and also provides that but one of its members, who are reduced to five, shall be appointed by the Governor, the rest being chosen by the Boards of Regents of the Normal Schools and the University, the Secretary of State, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Governor has said that he will veto such a bill. The basis for the measure was found in the Wisconsin Survey, conducted by Dr. William H. Allen, which charged inefficiency in both the teaching and the business management of the institution. Although the Governor is a Republican, progressive Republican Senators are responsible for the fatal amendment, their position being that any financial slackness would be corrected by the bill as amended, while the educational independence of the University would remain unimpaired.

In a sense larger than the merely legal, the lynching of the guilty is as reprehensible as the lynching of the innocent; but the latter crime naturally stirs even people who look with tolerance upon the other. The two negroes, father and son, who were killed in Georgia the other day by a mob that was too eager to revenge a murder to make sure of getting the real murderers, are still speaking in the editorial columns of Georgia newspapers, as well as in those of surrounding States. The Augusta *Chronicle* calls for "rewards large enough to bring every member of this murderous mob to justice; and then enough of the State's money to employ the best legal talent to convict." It does not make this demand merely upon the ground of the innocence of the dead, but upon the ground that lynching is insurrection, "a deliberate, armed assault on the authority of the State." No one could ask for more vigorous language than the *Chronicle* uses in its denunciation of the crime, and in its appeal to the Governor and the people to put down "this growing spirit of mob domination."

Some simple figures published by the Bureau of Education prompt the reflection that, if only culture were measured by statistics, we might begin to bear our heads very proudly. In 1908, there were 2,298 libraries of over 5,000 volumes each in this country, and in 1913, 2,850; while all the public libraries of America in 1913 housed 75,112,935 volumes, as against but 55,350,000 in 1908. In five years, in other words, we gained nearly one-third in the number of volumes available to student and reader. The disproportion between the increase in the number of libraries of more than 5,000 books, and the total increase in library holdings, goes to show that most of the gain must be accounted for by the activities of collections already large. More than half of the three million volumes acquired each year, moreover, are acquired in the North Atlantic States, the seats of well-established libraries. Nevertheless, there is much circumstantial evidence to show that these larger stores of books exert an increasing public influence. More and more activity in the way of extension characterizes the public library; in the cities it is developing its branches, and organizing new ones in the farthest suburbs; in the country the county library is sending its travelling cases into the remotest hamlets.

One contribution of the war to surgery has already been thought by the Paris Académie des Sciences to justify the award of the Lecomte triennial prize of $10,000 to Sir Almroth Wright. It is in the same field of wound-dressing in which progress was begun by the French surgeon who first left off cauterizing the injured parts. Sir Almroth Wright's work as author of the system of anti-typhoid inoculation, the system of therapeutic inoculations for bacterial infections, and of methods for measuring the protective substances in blood, gave him a basis for his researches in the General Hospital at Boulogne, and made possible rapid results. The difficulty of cleansing wounds under military conditions seems to have led doctors to discard aseptic treatment in favor of the free use of antiseptics. Sir Almroth Wright has shown that free drainage of wounds is desirable, the lymph exuding thus being kept pure; that if Listerism is overdone, the wound is shut, the lymph becomes decomposed, and germs develop. Infinitely more important are further investigations in vaccine-therapy, by which it is hoped that previous inoculation may make soldiers proof against infection by wounds. The award should give a more general reputation in this country to a man who deserves to be widely known on grounds other than his "Case Against Woman Suffrage."

Mr. Arthur G. Sedgwick was not perhaps widely known, but he was distinctively known. His friends—and they were many and warm—perceived in him an original personality. His wit had turns of its own, his outlook on life was unconventional, his knowledge and judgment were all the while manifesting themselves piquantly. Mr. Sedgwick's writings were varied and distinguished, but to those intimate with him they seemed perhaps to fall short of giving an adequate measure of his powers. Especially in his later years might it have been said of him, as of the poet Gray, that he did not "speak out" what was in him. Almost beyond doubt the last work of his pen was his contribution, two weeks ago, to the semi-centennial number of the *Nation*, to which, though laboring under the handicap of ill health, he devoted, with characteristic disregard of self, unflagging care and effort. It was the irony of fate that, at the very moment the news of his death was received, the editor of the *Nation* was engaged in writing him a letter of thanks for his article. Mr. Sedgwick's long connection with the *Nation* and the *Evening Post* was such as to leave of him in this office a unique tradition.

St. Clair McKelway was a man of such varied activities and genial gifts that his distinct work as editor was sometimes in danger of being overlooked. Finding time, as he did, to make himself felt in public education and in many civic and political causes, it was yet his long connection with the Brooklyn *Eagle* that meant most for him and his fame, and it was into his writing in its columns that he delighted to pour his best energies. As that paper itself became a sort of public institution in its own city, so did Dr. McKelway. His position, so fixed and interesting in all the flux of daily journalism, made him a unique figure. He is now spoken of as an old-fashioned editor. If by that is meant that he gave first place, not to sensationalism, but to knowledge, integrity, and a sense of public duty, it is the highest form of compliment. But the qualities which he displayed cannot go out of fashion in the newspaper world without leaving it poorer and less respected.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE VALUE OF WISE AND FIRM AMERICAN DIPLOMACY.

With the imminence of another American note to Germany, there has been a renewal of the talk about the futility of the process which our Government has been following. We are getting nowhere, some say. Time is merely wasted, and the strain on patience grows intolerable.

The record, however, on examination appears not so barren as these too quick despairers allege. A great deal has been accomplished by the steady representations of this Government to Germany. One position after another the German Government has abandoned or modified, under pressure from the United States. We have attained recognition of the rights of a neutral flag even in Germany's war zone. These were at first denied, but now they are fully admitted.

It is worth while to cast the eye back over the official documents. On February 4, in the original "war-zone" proclamation, "neutral ships" were warned to keep away, as "attacks intended for hostile ships may also hit neutral ships." Our Government, on February 10, sharply challenged Germany's position in this matter, asserting our rights and announcing that it would hold the German Government strictly accountable for any violation of them. The first response was as gruff as von Tirpitz himself, the German Government, on February 18, informing our State Department that if, despite the warning, neutral ships were to be so rash as to enter "these closed waters," "Germany disclaims all responsibility" for such "unfortunate accidents" as might occur to them. But this *non possumus* has since been given up completely. We have had the full admission of responsibility in the cases of the Gulflight and the Nebraskan. Moreover, the German Government has climbed down on the general principle. In its note of May 31 it declared that "the German Government has no intention of submitting neutral ships in the war zone . . . to attacks by a submarine. On the contrary, the German forces have repeatedly been instructed most specifically to avoid attacks on such ships." And in the latest German note we had assurances that "American ships will not be hindered in the prosecution of legitimate shipping, and the lives of American citizens in neutral vessels shall not be placed in jeopardy." It is a decided retreat which American diplomacy has forced upon the German Government. Neutral flags are to be respected even by the terrorists in the war zone.

The larger question, admittedly, remains deadlocked. For the safety of American citizens on passenger ships under a belligerent flag, Germany has, as yet, refused to give guarantees. Nor has she conceded that the sinking of such unresisting vessels, without warning, is both a clear breach of international law and a crime against humanity. Here is the main and great argument, to the height of which the President must again rise. But it will not do to say that his task is hopeless. Having wrung such substantial concessions from Germany, he may yet secure larger ones. Light on American sentiment, and its significance, has dawned slowly in Berlin, but it has been increasing. And it will not do, judging by the past, to be so sure in advance that further protests and demands by President Wilson will avail naught.

In any event, however, is it right to assert that our protests will have been proved in vain? By no means. The American Government has had, of course, in its notes to Germany certain immediate objects. It has sought redress for injuries. It has asked assurances that they will not be repeated. But over and above all this, the President has been the champion of general rights, and has stood as the defender of neutrals and of the recognized rules of civilized warfare. And who will say that this is of trifling importance, solely because Germany has not so far yielded to our specific demands? Irrespective of that, American diplomacy has made a contribution of the first consequence to the whole idea of international law and its sanctity. This is why a sober newspaper like the *Westminster Gazette* could say of President Wilson's first note on the Lusitania that it was the greatest single event of the war. It was, in the first place, the voice of reason and of law making itself heard amid the clash of arms. And, secondly, it was a voice speaking to the future. The war will be over, some day. And then will come the task of redefining and strengthening certain parts of international law. In that great work the United States will have aided enormously by its repeated and consistent assertion of the law of nations. Our diplomatic notes will be cited as leading cases. The position which our Government has taken with so much wisdom and firmness will be of immense influence in any Peace Congress or Congress of the Nations that may be held. What our policy has sought has been not merely the securing of American rights and the upholding of American dignities, but the safeguarding and the fresh sanctioning of the reign of law throughout the entire world.

THE $3,000,000,000 BRITISH LOAN.

The announcement that the offer of the new 4½ per cent. British war loan has attracted subscriptions of no less than $3,000,000,000, is in many ways a matter of interest. We are living in a financial era of large figures. Until this war broke out, the largest single loan ever floated by a European Government was, we believe, the $400,000,000 French loan of 1871, issued to pay the first instalment of the Prussian indemnity. England had never floated a single loan in any sum greater than the $300,000,000 issue of 1901 during the Boer War. Perhaps the largest nominal issue was our own Government's 6 per cent. loan of 1862, which aggregated $515,000,000; but many months were required to get the total sum, and it was placed by an army of canvassers who hunted the whole United States, like book-agents, for customers.

Since the European war began England has placed two loans of $1,750,000,000 and $3,000,000,000, respectively; Germany has floated two of $1,250,000,000 and $2,250,000,000; France has raised upwards of $1,000,000,000 on her loans, and there remain the new obligations of Austria, Russia, and Italy. The present English war loan far overtops all others in the sum involved. But the whole series, in England and on the Continent, has been progressive in this regard. Not only the prodigious magnitude of this single borrowing, but the rapid increase in the amount which it has been necessary to raise on each successive recourse to the market, directs attention forcibly to the question what is to be the outcome of this extraordinary chapter in finance.

In order to understand all the aspects of that problem, it is necessary to examine again the circumstances under which this present loan was placed. There were numerous and very unusual inducements for the enormous subscription. Its rate of interest of 4½ per cent. gave a larger return to the investor than any public loan issued by England since the Napoleonic wars. Further than this, the Government pledged itself that, in case of future loan issues at an even higher rate of interest, holders of the 4½ per cents should be allowed to exchange their bonds on equal terms for the new issues. That pledge was not made in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the case of the 3½ per cent. war loan of last November, and it did not of course apply to the British Government bonds outstanding before the war. But the Government, in announcing the present loan, offered to holders of those earlier issues the privilege of converting their holdings, on a basis regulated by existing market prices, into the new 4½ per cents—on this condition, however, that they subscribe in cash for a further equivalent amount of the new loan.

Here was a very powerful inducement for cash subscriptions, even by investors who may not previously have intended to participate. To what extent the $3,000,000,000 applications were called forth by it, the cabled summaries of the subscription have not yet pointed out. If every holder of the old consols or the first war loan had responded, the total cash subscription for that purpose would itself have exceeded $4,000,000,000. But it is probable that by far the greater part of them could not spare the money for the requisite cash subscription.

Until the returns are classified, however, it will be impossible to say how great a part this special inducement played. Nor has it yet been announced how much has been raised through the recourse, novel to British Government finance, of subscriptions to bonds in very small denominations. That the expedient was productive is plain enough, however, from the Exchequer's announcement that, up to the present date, 547,000 separate subscriptions, made through the post offices for such small allotments, have footed up $75,000,000—an average application of $137. This part of the subscription list is still left open.

The larger question, as to the influence upon the general market of this enormous borrowing at so considerable an advance in the rate of interest, remains exceedingly obscure. In its immediate consequences, the subscription to the loan has caused a fall of 2 to 5 per cent. in nearly all other high-grade investment bonds dealt in on London's Stock Exchange. This was clearly due to realizing on these holdings, to raise the funds for subscribing to the 4½ per cents. The operation has also dislodged substantial amounts of English holdings of American stocks and bonds, of which $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 are believed to have been sold on the New York market since the new British loan was announced. It is not clear to what extent this movement will be continuous. Subscriptions made with a view to converting consols and the older war loan must be paid in full in cash, and these payments may have been largely made at the earliest date assigned—July 20—because a discount of 4½ per cent. per annum on the price is allowed for payment in full. But the regular payments of instalments occur at fortnightly intervals until near the end of October.

Each of these huge European war loans raises again the question how long and under what conditions this unprecedented absorption of capital in war can be continued. Since the process is not drawing on an inexhaustible stock of available capital, the difficulties in the way of future loans, and the necessity for fresh inducements of some special sort, are likely to be persistent. Yet the problem, though differing in degree from all previous experience in the finance of war, does not differ in kind.

In 1797 Great Britain's public credit and financial resources seemed to be at the lowest ebb; yet in the seventeen subsequent years of the Napoleonic wars, the Government raised not far from $2,000,000,000. Our own Government's experience in the Civil War is a case very much in point. Last week one speaker in the House of Lords warned England that, even if peace were to be restored by the end of March, 1916, the national debt would have reached such a total that taxation on the present basis would fail by $70,000,000 to meet the annual interest on it. In our own Civil War, however, the Government's total ordinary revenue, in 1862, was $52,000,000, and the charge for interest on the public debt in 1866 was $133,000,000. But between 1862 and 1866 additional taxation had increased the annual revenue to no less than $520,000,000. This is what England also will undoubtedly have to do.

WARFARE VERSUS TERRORISM.

It would hardly be possible for an international issue to be more sharply defined than that between the American and the German Governments. Two recent developments tended in some degree to soften the character of the immediate situation—the statement concerning the attempted minimizing of destruction of life in recent submarine attacks on merchant ships, and the apology for the torpedoing of the Nebraskan. But the issue of principle remained precisely what it was. And that issue has now been brought home to us once more, as acutely as ever, through the attack on the Orduna. It seems plain that, but for good navigation and good fortune, the slaughter of American citizens on the Lusitania would here have been repeated, on a smaller scale, but without even the possibility of the pretexts resorted to in the Lusitania case, since the Orduna was westward bound, and had no war supplies on board.

Our Government stands for rights of neutrals in time of war which, till now, no nation and no writer upon the law of nations so much as thought of questioning. And these rights are not a matter of degree, a question of more or less, an affair connected with complexities of geographical situation or of the relative position of the combatants in the course of a war's progress. The right of neutrals to travel upon the high seas in merchant ships, whether of neutral or of belligerent nationality, without having their lives put in danger by any wilful act of war, is but part of the immunity attaching to all non-combatants on board such ships. The officers and crew, though of enemy nationality, are held safe from attack so far as their lives are concerned; the risk involved in their enterprise is a risk of property only. When Americans speak of the killing of a hundred of their fellow-citizens on the Lusitania as murder they do so because it was not an incident of legitimate war, but an act from beginning to end in clear violation of one of the fundamental rules of warfare.

The position taken by President Wilson rests squarely on this foundation. Consider what would be the logical and inevitable effect of abandoning this principle of international law. That effect can be put almost in a word. The difference between the accepted rules and those which the German Government asks us to agree to is the difference between warfare and terrorism. Commerce is lawfully subjected in war to such hindrances and losses as it may be within the power of the naval forces of the enemy to inflict; the purpose of the new plan proposed by Germany, and actually put into practice by von Tirpitz, is to paralyze all commerce with the enemy nation through the operation of terror.

It happens that during the past week or two an interesting sidelight has been thrown upon this matter. A considerable number of cases have been discovered of the placing of bombs upon merchant ships sailing from New York. The bombs did not work the mischief intended. But, as has been pointed out by one of the shipping men, "the failure of the bombs to explode cannot be considered complete failure for the bomb-planter, for, in our opinion, their scheme is de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signed as much to terrify seamen of merchant ships as to destroy cargo. Could they prevent the ships' departure from this country, their success would be as complete as though they destroyed the vessels at sea." In like manner, the actual destruction wrought by the German submarines by no means measures the value placed upon their activities by the heads of the German Government. What they really hope to accomplish—or at least what they did hope when they instituted the policy, and what they designed in such acts as the Lusitania massacre—is to paralyze all commerce with Great Britain by force of sheer terrorism.

What the American Government stands for is nothing less than a refusal to sanction this kind of reign of terror. And at bottom there is even in the German mind only one real reason for asserting the right to make this tremendous innovation in the methods of war. That reason is put forward almost parenthetically in the last German note. "In addition," it says, "it may be pointed out that if the Lusitania had been spared, thousands of cases of munitions would have been sent to Germany's enemies and thereby thousands of German mothers and children robbed of bread-winners." This is the real thing—everything else is mere pretext. The essence of Germany's position, in the case of the Lusitania as in the case of Belgium, is not that what she did was lawful, but that, whether lawful or unlawful, it was justified because to have done otherwise would have been to her own injury. But if we are not to protest at the murder of American citizens, because had they not been murdered the cause of the Allies would have been helped "and thereby thousands of German mothers and children robbed of bread-winners," there is no point at which we can draw the line. If the German Government were deliberately to procure the destruction of every ammunition-factory in the United States, or the assassination of their owners, that would likewise tend to protect thousands of German mothers and children from being robbed of their bread-winners; and American property and American lives could easily escape that fate by acceding to the German desire that their business cease. But we fancy that no American, not even any German-American, would have much difficulty in seeing that the beautiful motive assigned would not exempt the German Government from the consequences of its acts.

The issue between America and Germany is the issue between law and lawlessness. That would be the case even though the law which we have undertaken to vindicate were simply the established law of nations—simply the embodiment of unchallenged rights of American citizens—even though that law rested on no principle that carried with it far-reaching and profound consequences. To assert the supremacy of law when flagrantly and arrogantly defied would itself be a national duty of the highest order. But when it is realized how vital is the thing actually at stake, and how profound is the issue between the respective nations, the duty is seen to have a character of peculiar solemnity—just that solemnity which marked both of the notes addressed to Germany on the destruction of the Lusitania.

THE LAW AND THE SLEEPING CAR.

When the Supreme Court, a few weeks ago, gave its decision on the Wisconsin statute prohibiting the making up of an upper berth in a sleeping car until the berth is engaged, it seemed that in the majority and minority opinions on the case there was likely to be highly instructive material bearing on legal theory. The standpoint of the majority, which pronounced the statute invalid, it was easy enough to conjecture; but it was not quite so easy to guess just what were the grounds of dissent on the part of Judges Holmes and McKenna. The majority opinion is now before us; but it appears that the minority judges filed no written opinion, so that the chief part of our curiosity has to remain unsatisfied. But for this there is compensation in the interesting nature of the points brought out in the majority opinion, points which relate not only to the law but also to the facts.

Of course, the gist of the whole matter lies in the circumstance that the Wisconsin statute seeks to compel the company to furnish to the man who has paid for a lower berth, unless the upper berth happens also to have been engaged, all that accommodation to which he would have been entitled if he paid for the whole section. This constitutes on its face a taking of private property without compensation; and the burden of proof naturally rests upon the upholders of the statute to overthrow this presumption by showing that the regulation serves a public purpose, coming either within the general police power of the State or within those special powers which it may exercise in the regulation of common carriers. If we may hazard a guess as to the grounds upon which the dissenting judges based their action, we should say that they are probably to be found in connection rather with the second than with the first of these classes of powers. For, without any sharp difference of theory, it might be perfectly possible to hold divergent views as to the status of a sleeping car in a system of transportation. "A sleeping car," says the majority opinion, "may not be an 'inn on wheels,' but the operating company does engage to furnish its patrons with a place in which they can rest without intrusion upon their privacy. Holding out these inducements and seeking this patronage, the company is entitled to the privilege of managing its own business in its own way, so long as it does not injuriously affect the health, comfort, safety, and convenience of the public." But there is a limit beyond which this kind of consideration can not be carried. If, as a matter of fact, the given regulation were of some slight disadvantage to the company, while it increased very greatly the satisfaction of the travelling public, it might be quite possible for a judge, however scrupulous in protecting property against confiscation, to hold that "the rule of reason" permitted the State to establish such a regulation.

The story of the statute itself, as told in the majority opinion, is decidedly interesting. It appears that an earlier act, passed in 1907, instead of prohibiting the letting down of the upper berth, left the matter to the choice of the occupant of the lower. This was pronounced unconstitutional by the Wisconsin Supreme Court on the ground that it was an obvious attempt "to appropriate the property of one for the benefit of another, in violation of several constitutional safeguards." By making the prohibition general, it was sought to obviate this objection. The lowering of the upper berth, when made mandatory, was commanded in the interest of the public, and not of an individual. "But," says the Supreme Court, "the statute does not purport to be a health measure, and cannot be sustained as such. For if lowering the upper berth injuriously interfered with the ventilation of the car and the health of the passengers, it would follow that upper berths should not be lowered, and if it was harmful to let down the uppers, it would be even more harmful to permit additional passengers to come into the car and occupy them." It seems difficult to escape from this reasoning; and, though it relates to so comparatively trivial a matter as the question of the upper berth, its bearing is extremely wide. There is no telling in what cases of critical public importance it may be appealed to in the future.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The mental satisfaction with which one may follow the reasoning as to principles of law is unalloyed; one can hardly say the same as regards some of the matters of fact referred to in the introductory summary. "There was evidence," we are told, "that an ordinary sleeping car was better ventilated than an ordinary passenger coach, said to be due to the fact that the coach not only carried more passengers, but did not have the ventilating appliances in use on sleeping cars." It is fortunate that the authority of the Supreme Court is in no way involved in the correctness of this assertion. We do not know what scientific experts may have given the evidence in question; and we are prepared to believe that there was nothing wrong about their physics or their mathematics. But if the air in a sleeping car is a specimen of better ventilation, give us worse ventilation every time. Persons addicted to the "exact sciences"—and persons entirely innocent of all science—are prone to look upon the law as an unscientific jumble; but the fact is that, within its more or less inevitable limitations, the law can stand critical examination at least as well as any system of thought that has to do with the ordinary interests of men. This particular decision, for example, while touching on many delicate and difficult matters, squares very well with common-sense at all points having to do with the operation of the law; the only place where we are confronted with something that flies in the face of every man's familiar experience is where the simple subject of the quality, quantity, and circulation of air is dealt with. No amount of expert testimony can induce us to believe that we are in the enjoyment of fine ventilation when every organ of our body cries out that we are on the verge of suffocation or nausea.

THE AMERICAN TRUTH SOCIETY, LIMITED.

Jesting Pilate, who asked, "What is truth?" and then turned away, ought at least to have gone, first, to 1133 Broadway, New York city. For there is domiciled the American Truth Society. The headquarters are not extensive, but if truth can be found at the bottom of a well, why not in a single office? Infinite riches in a little room! The riches, in the case of the Truth Society, consist mainly of a series of flying leaves telling us how to secure fair play for Germany, how to stop the war, and, in the latest pamphlet, how to head off the "Peril of American Finance," owing to the "British Raid upon Our Resources." In this last publication, particularly, we find not only riches but richness.

For so obviously powerful an organization, the American Truth Society is very much of a sensitive plant in the matter of personal identification. Truth is mighty and will, of course, prevail without any name being attached to it; but the printed appeals of the Truth Society are singularly barren of signs of authorship or responsibility. The Society was organized, so it tells us, at a meeting held in New York, on January 18, but who was there, it forgets to inform the reader. However, its objects are clearly set forth in its charter. Among these is the determined purpose "to propagate the history of the United States amongst the people of the United States, and to oppose all attempts to garble, falsify, misrepresent, or suppress the history of the United States." This naturally provokes the inquiry which Mrs. Gilbert used to put with such delightful inflection in Jerome's play—"Of Irish extraction, I presume?" The suspicion is confirmed by the name to be found on the letterhead of the American Truth Society—the only place where we have been able to discover any names of members of the Society at all—namely, President, Jeremiah A. O'Leary. There is, or was, a German-named Secretary and a German-named Treasurer, but we shall insist upon claiming for the Celtic spirit the logic and the unconscious humor that is contained in "The Gold Protest Against War."

The argument proceeds by first laying a foundation of facts. It is built with such corner-stones as this: "Do you know that Eastern financiers have already loaned to the Allies from their proprietary banks $200,000,000, and are arranging to borrow $300,000,000 more of your money solely for Great Britain?" Such words to the wise ought to be sufficient. American banks are being raided by the British, and the only way to prevent a panic is for Americans to join in the raid. At any rate, they are to make sure that all the gold is drawn from the banks, so that they will have no basis for the issue of notes, and therefore will be unable to lend any more to the enemies of Germany. Hence a few simple rules for patriots, delivered with more than Polonius-like gravity:

(1.) Carry a twenty-dollar gold piece in your pocket or at home as a protest against the financing of our arms and our munition exporters.

Form an endless "gold chain" by writing your friends and interviewing your neighbors, urging these suggestions.

(2.) If an employer, pay your employees in gold coin and thus put gold in circulation.

(3.) In withdrawing your accounts from banks demand gold specie, or gold certificates, Federal Reserve notes, or United States Treasury notes. This money is the legal tender of our country (United States Revised Statutes, Sections 3,584 to 3,590 inclusive).

(4.) Investigate your bank, and if you believe your bank is an unworthy depository of your money, you have the legal right to demand your account in gold specie, gold certificates, Federal Reserve notes, or United States Treasury notes. Your money in a safe deposit vault cannot be diverted to finance the killing of men.

Now, the Germans are capable of many wonderful triumphs, but we don't believe they were equal to this. Such gallant disregard of human nature, such loving application of whim and prejudice to financial transactions, never came, we'll be bound, from a Teutonic mind. They savor too plainly of the characteristics which Irish writers, from Tom Moore down, have shown us in their countrymen, always blarneying or fighting, forever inconsequent in reasoning, but unfailing in picturesqueness. The solemn advice given above, to head off the nefarious schemes of the Saxon, could only have come from one who would burn the notes of a bank in order to be revenged upon it, or would endorse the note of a neighbor, knowing that he would not pay it when due, and chuckling with joy as he thought how that would embarrass its greedy holder. If such a name as O'Leary had not been given as president of the American Truth Society, it really would have had to be invented.

The whole thing is predominantly comic, but it has its serious side. The American Truth Society is but one of many similar organizations. They are run by nobody knows who—and usually nobody knows where. Yet they pose as great organs of public opinion. They appear as promoters of mass-meetings. They issue imposing addresses. Yes, and they spend a good deal of money. Where does it come from? There has never been any concealment of the fact that the Germans have had a considerable fund for their propaganda in this country. That is their right. Much of it they have expended to some advantage. But any amount of it which they may have put into queer organizations, masquerading as spontaneous American societies of protest, is, we beg to assure them, absolutely wasted. Whatever they may decide to do with their twenty-dollar gold pieces, they ought not to put them in the pockets of men in buckram.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Correspondence

THE CALL FOR ECONOMY—THE REGISTRATION AND MUNITIONS BILLS—THE CASE OF THE ARMENIAN.

By JAMES F. MUIRHEAD.

LONDON, July 2.

The motto of the day in England is "Waste not, want not"; and no wonder, seeing that the annual national expenditure has increased by a billion of pounds sterling. We talk of nothing but thrift and saving. And the object of our thrift is to buy coupons and bonds of the Government war loan, to be used in the purchase of ammunition for killing as many men as possible in the shortest possible time. And nevertheless we believe this saving, with this object, to be a high and holy duty.

Prime ministers and bishops, bankers and generals, professors and prominent women are all appealing to us to live the simple life, to reduce our allowance of meat, to abstain from luxuries, to leave most of the smoking (like all of the swearing) to our troops in Flanders, and to see, so far as lies in our power, that our exports in goods and cash shall represent nothing except payment for articles directly useful in the prosecution of the war. The answer to this appeal, so far as subscriptions to the war loan can give it, promises to be satisfactory. The vouchers for small amounts, in particular, are being taken up in enormous quantities. In the two German war loans, the purchasers of stock in quantities of less than £100 accounted for a sum of £120,000,000, equivalent to about 17 per cent. of the whole. It is expected that our small investors will do at least as well. The value of small savings may be illustrated by the fact that a saving of 2s. 6d. a head per week would yield nearly £300,000,000 a year. A point of interest to American investors is that a measure seems not unlikely to exempt from income tax the interest paid to persons resident outside the United Kingdom. This is important, because, with our present income tax (very likely, alas, to increase), the actual yield of the loan would be £3 18s. 9d. per cent., instead of £4 10s. I understand that the American income-tax law of last year makes a concession of this kind to foreign investors on American securities.

Before leaving the question of waste, it may be noted that a considerable body of opinion considers that the British Government must in this matter pay some heed to the admonition, "Physician, heal thyself." This applies not only to the waste of food in military camps and the expenses, due to red tape, in some of our offices, but also to the fact that many mature and skilled artisans, who would be very useful at home, are serving at the front, while many unmarried youngsters of no particular skill are still among the slackers at home. But this brings us to the thorny question of universal compulsory service!

Mr. Lloyd George's Supply of Munitions bill turned out to be substantially of the character I outlined in my letter of June 18. Its passage through the House of Commons was attended with considerable criticism (for the most part in the nature of friendly amendment), but with virtually no real opposition. Sir John Simon explained that its object was not so much to secure compulsory power as to take advantage of the voluntary spirit and organize it efficiently. Most of the Labor groups concerned have accepted the conditions of the bill without demur; but it would not be England if there were not some dissentients. Thus the miners object to compulsory arbitration, but have given Mr. Lloyd George satisfactory assurances that they will "deliver the goods," and avoid strikes. The cotton operatives make the same objection and will (it is expected) give similar guarantees. It is, indeed, quite possible that there will be no need to declare any establishment "controlled," as the power to do may in practice make the deed done. Masters and men alike seem to recognize that no risk must be run in the matter of production of munitions; and thus the restriction of profits and the abrogation of trade-union regulations will be cheerfully accepted.

Whatever else it has effected, there is no doubt that this agitation over munitions has done much to impress the gravity of the situation on those who have hitherto been a little impervious. The psychologic and moral tension has been stretched to greater resonance, and has awakened echoes in new quarters. It has made us feel the need of united action, and it has tended to focus our attention on the more dynamic strain of leaders, like Mr. Lloyd George. It has brought home to us that we, too, manifestly possess the defects of our qualities, and is making us recognize more and more keenly that what are mere foibles in time of peace may become sins or even crimes in time of war. We are still determined to resist the Prussianization of our tactics and to carry on the struggle in a manner consistent with our own traditions; but we see that our inherited methods must be purged of all dross and applied in their most perfect form. We still believe that Britannism is better than Germanism; but we are learning that our advantage is not enough to allow any slackness in its use and that we must turn on the full head of our supply. To use Lord Haldane's phrase, we are becoming, to some extent at least, a people of reflection as well as of energy and resource.

The National Registration bill is not likely to enjoy quite so peaceful a progress as the Supply of Munitions bill. It provides for the registration of all persons (male and female) between the ages of fifteen and sixty-five, with a view to ascertaining their potential capacity for national service. The root of the opposition will be the very natural desire to continue to adhere for as long as possible to our traditional voluntary system, and the suspicion that this compulsory registration is only the first step to compulsory service all round, whether military or industrial. Some of the opponents are men of high standing and unimpeachable patriotism, whose attitude must be considered as free of any factitious element. After all, it will be more of a triumph if we can win without exchanging British methods for German. The *questionnaire* of the bill does not seem as clear as it might be, but I understand that Government will be quite open to amendments on certain points. The inclusion of women in the registration has also caused some discussion, and has even been ascribed to somewhat unworthy motives; but I am unable to see in it anything but plain common-sense and fair play.

It should be noted, however, that many of our wisest thinkers do not consider the National Registration bill as an abandonment of the principle of voluntary service. It is rather in the nature of a system of channels into which our copious streams of voluntary help may be easily guided and through which they may be properly distributed. It is an effort to remove all barriers and obstacles, so that the course of the most diffident, scatter-brained, and casual of well-wishers may be made obvious and attractive—a scheme to make it impossible for ignorance or inattention to be pleaded as an excuse for inactivity. For there is undoubtedly a huge reservoir of somewhat sluggish and inert good-will waiting to be tapped, as well as many ready volunteers waiting only for a clear lead.

The Germans have just torpedoed another vessel, the Armenian, with American citizens on board. As, no doubt, it will be alleged that the Armenian brought her fate upon herself by refusing to stop after a shot had been fired across her bows, I wish to call attention to a point made by the *Daily Chronicle* of this date. Under the conditions of naval warfare hitherto subsisting, the Armenian would certainly have been bound to stop or take the consequences, if a German cruiser had fired a warning shot. But in the case of submarine warfare, as practiced by the Germans in this war, the captain of the Armenian knew that his vessel would be sunk in any case. As a brave and patriotic man, he was bound to take the one chance, slight as it was, of saving his ship. Hence he is in no sense responsible for the deaths of the American members of his crew, who were sacrificed solely to the needs of Germany's illegal method of submarine attack.

A WAR BOOK OF ANATOLE FRANCE.

By STODDARD DEWEY.

PARIS, July 3.

Anatole France at seventy offered himself for the military service of his country in her hour of need. He now takes the lead in a series of five patriotic books sold for the *mutilés de la guerre*—the maimed and mangled of this horrible war.

The other volumes are by Maurice Barrès, Remy de Gourmont, Gabriele d'Annunzio, and Charles Maurras. These are great names of the passing generation, but it is the first time they are found together. It is an instance among many of the *Union sacrée* which is one of the clearest results of war in the French people. The publisher serves in the French army and, like the writers, has no personal interest in the sale of these books. They are published "to the memory of Jean Pierre Barbier, dead on the field of honor the 26th December, 1914, by his friends." He too was a writer, but of the generation who are coming.

Anatole France's contribution is a miscellany around the fixed idea of these harsh times. It has a dedication, in facsimile of the author's handwriting, to "Albert the King":

King, in you Republicans hail a hero and a just man.

It would be hard if there were not intellectual eating and drinking in any collection of writings by Anatole France. Not the least savory here are words which have come to him from disciples at the front. They surely write to him as *cher Maître*. In a Christmas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeal, he had summoned as a witness to French courage and devotedness a military doctor, dead as he supposed at his post of duty:

"In bombarded Ypres, he was caring for fifty-four of the German wounded, and, being urged to quit his hospital, refused, jealous to give enemies the example of humanity—and he was killed at the bedside of a German soldier by a German shell."

Except for the killing, this first report was authentic. The doctor wrote back in person, illuminating victims really dead:

"I did not die, . . . but I escaped death only by an extraordinary chance.

"I was making out my report at the exact spot where the shell fell. I left my worktable some seconds before its fall. It was an enormous *marmite* (pot) that tore down a whole wing of the hospital and made mincemeat of Léonie and her old dog. A poor little black woollen shawl with a few bloody fragments hanging to it was all that was left of the cook of Ypres hospital. At the sight of it, Charles Staniforth (the English interpreter who had already given out the report of the doctor's death with the rest) was weeping. And I said to him—'See! there beside Léonie I was writing to General Vidal.'

"He looked at me strangely. Perhaps I struck him as a ghost might. . . . Good Léonie! a simple soul, with a heart of the people, a sacrificial heart! Against fear and for protection, she had set up between two slim candles an image of Notre Dame de Thuynes, the patroness of Ypres who, in other days, saved the city. Every day the image changed place, now on the sideboard, now on a chair, even on the floor, always flanked by its two candles. . . .

"The same shell buried M. Gaymant under the ruins of his pharmacy and cut in pieces an English provision convoy. . . . Of all these victims only M. Gaymant survived. He was for weeks in the Poperinghe hospital. While we were dressing his many wounds and wiping off with oxygenated water the dust from bricks that encrusted them, he smiled and said: 'Now, doctor, I run no more risk—I am like a fortress, I am built of lime and sand.'

"Belgian humor is unspoilable."

The doctor explains his own escape as of one "predestined to bring back to you, in the beautiful light of love, the veritable meaning of the State!"

Anatole France gives ear otherwise to voices uniting the French people in their country's extremity:

"Stones speak to those who know how to listen.

"The little town says to Frenchmen looking down from the hilltop:

"'See, I am old, but I am beautiful. My children's piety has embroidered me a robe of towers and spires and dented gables and belfries. I am a good mother; I teach labor and all the arts of peace, I exhort citizens to that scorn of danger which makes them invincible. I nurse my children in my arms. And, when their task is done, they come, one after another, to sleep at my feet under the grass where sheep are feeding. They pass; but I remain, to keep memory of them. I am their memory. This is why they owe all to me, for man is man only because he remembers. My cloak is torn and my bosom pierced in wars. I receive wounds which they say are mortal. But I live because I hope. Learn of me—it is holy hope that saves our country.'"

More in Anatole France's peace manner is the dialogue "after Herodotus" between Xerxes and Demaratus, that exiled King of Sparta who took refuge at the Persian Court.

"All my task—and I have found it very pleasant—was to gather into a single dialogue maxims and conversations scattered through the old historian. . . .

"Certainly I have not tried to make Greeks resemble ourselves. . . . It is no very philosophic amusement to dress up the ancients so as to recognize ourselves in them. But to descry in all times and countries Man, changeless Man, and discover in distant ages features seemingly peculiar to our own and really holding to human depths that change never, and to get a sudden glimpse that our species, varying so slowly, has not varied at all in epochs whose memory we keep—this it is that moves and interests and speaks strongly to imagination.

"If I mistake not, such human depths, such characters peculiar to our species, appear strikingly in these extracts from good Herodotus. This is why I think my fellow-countrymen, reading them, will more than once call back their thoughts from the 75th Olympiad to the present hour so grave, so full for us of glories and sorrows and big with a future in which we put high, vast hopes.

. . . . . .

"*Xerxes.* Demaratus, I wish to ask about something which I am desirous to know. You are aware that the Greeks are gathered to defend this pass (Thermopylæ) under the command of Leonidas, King of Sparta. A spy I sent out has been observing those who hold this side of the wall which they have raised to close the pass. They are Spartans. Putting their arms down by the wall, they went naked to their athletic sports or combed carefully their hair. I cannot believe that is the way they prepare themselves to die fighting. They seem to me, on the contrary, to be acting very ridiculously, and I predict that, within four days, they will retreat. What do you think?

"*Demaratus.* O King, fear not feigned words from me. I have told thee already what men the Greeks are. They nourish no vast desires and are content with what they possess. They fear the divine Nemesis which lowers those who lift themselves up too high, and they keep measure in all things. . . . These men have come to defend the pass against thee and they are making ready to do so. Now this is their custom—before making their sacrifice of life, they crown their heads with fillets and wreaths.

"*Xerxes.* What you say, Demaratus, is scarcely believable. How can these Spartans, so few in number, fight my numberless army?

. . . . . .

"*Xerxes.* Man for man, a Persian is worth more than a Greek, as I shall make you see. For Persians, commanded by one alone, exceed their natural valiance by all the greatness of that which is imposed on them and which leads them to deeds that of themselves they would never dream of doing. For those who are least brave, obedience takes the place of courage and the fear of the master is stronger in them than fear of the enemy. Scourged onward, they throw themselves against lances and javelins. Such are Persian soldiers. Yours, being equal and free and obeying not one only chief, do in battle only their own pleasure and are inspired only by their heart which oftenest is but middling—for, in all countries, great hearts are rare.

"*Demaratus.* Greeks are free, O King; but they are not free every way. . . . As to Sparta, there not dying but flying is death. O King, such is the truth.

"*Xerxes.* I will disclose to you another advantage of the Persians over the Greeks. It is this—the Persians are closely united under my authority, and the Greeks are for ever quarrelling with one another. . . .

"*Demaratus.* Their dissensions ceased at thy approach, O King. . . .

"*Xerxes.* No matter, Heaven is on my side. Alone among men, Persians know the true gods. . . My design is not only to conquer Greece, but all Europe. Europe is beautiful, her heavens kind and her earth fruitful. . . . Of all mortals, I alone am worthy to possess her.

"*Demaratus.* Son of Darius, if thou believest thyself a god, if thou thinkest to command an army of immortals, thou hast not to listen to my opinion. But if thou dost acknowledge thyself to be a man commanding men, think how fortune is like a wheel ever turning and overturning those it has uplifted.

. . . . . .

"After these words Xerxes dismissed Demaratus, without anger. He was not irritated against him because he believed him to be out of his senses."

These scattered extracts show Anatole France at his best—in the present need. What his present faith is he proclaims in three final letters. To the *Clarion* of London:

"The Allies owe to all Europe and owe to themselves to pursue this war of liberation until the complete stifling of the Pan-German aspirations which have troubled Europe forty years long.

"They must, at the price of the most cruel sacrifices, destroy to the very root the military power of Germany and German Austria. —No peace, no truce, till the enemy of human kind is brought to earth!"

To the Russian *Novosti*, April 26:

"Friends, this war which we did not wish we shall wage to the end; we shall pursue our terrible, bountiful work to its entire accomplishment, to the total destruction of the military power of Germany."

To W. English Walling, New York:

"The idea they are sowing in America at this hour, to hasten the end of the war by prohibiting the exportation of arms and ammunition, proceeds not, I swear to you, from any French inspiration. No more does it proceed from any really human inspiration. For neither France and her Allies, nor the whole world, would profit aught by a peace that would leave still subsisting that perpetual cause of war—German Militarism."

Quite apart from the thought enshrined in such pages and the deserving object of the sale, the book has been given a form worthy of booklovers. ("Sur la voie glorieuse," par Anatole France. Paris: Champion; 3.50 francs).

The end, sudden and somewhat surprising, is an "Invocation" in lapidary style that Dr. Johnson might have approved, in spite of his aversion to Americans:

American Union
born gloriously in storm
nursed from infancy
by Liberty
on the milk of the strong,
Thou who hast consecrated thy robust youth
to superhuman toils
People just and magnanimous
Hail

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Personality of the State

By HAROLD LASKI.

What is the "Germany" that is to-day a thing so sinister in its import? What is the "England" for the destruction of which that "Germany" makes angry appeal? Are these states persons? Are they, in some mystic sense, capable of transcending their constituent members? Is it true that there exists a Brother Jonathan who is all Americans, and yet more than they? We are back here at what William James called the most fundamental of problems—that of the One and the Many. Is the state at bottom pluralist or monist? From our answer there flow consequences of the deepest significance. The state, Professor Kuno Francke declares, "is a spiritual collective personality leading a life of its own, beyond and above the life of individuals . . . it embraces all the higher activities of man." And so we are to combine in its service, to lavish upon it our deepest affections, because, in the end, all for which we have reverence is in some sort its part.

That is an important standpoint. The result of it is the intense unity of modern Germany, a unity philosophically justified by Hegel and politically exalted by Treitzschke. Is it true that the state is thus transcendent? Have we, in fact, humbly to subjugate ourselves to it because it "embraces all the higher activities of man"? At the outset we may note that we tend, in our political thinking, to adopt a sort of mystic monism as the true avenue of thought. We represent a state as a vast series of concentric circles, each one enveloping the other, as we move from individual to family, from family to village, from village to city, thence to the all-embracing state. We do talk of England, Greece, America, as single, personal forces, transcending the men and women who have made them; we personalize, that is to say, the collective body. "Rome," writes Lord Bryce, "sacrificed her domestic freedom that she might become the mistress of others." Here is a Rome beyond her citizens, a woman terrible in the asceticism of her supreme sacrifice. The habit is common to other things. Lloyds is something to us very different from the individual underwriters composing it. The Bank of England is not merely its governor and company; it has become—the phrase is significant—the "little old lady of Threadneedle Street," but no one would write of seven distinguished merchants as a little old lady. A man belongs to a labour-union; undeniably he thinks of it as essentially distinct from its members or officials. Nor, on a lesser plane, is this untrue of club or school. The National Arts Club has "its" rooms and "its" pictures. Eton is not five hundred boys nor a collection of ancient buildings. Clearly when we take any group of people to whom some kindred idea or common purpose may be ascribed, we seem to evolve from it a thing, a personality, that, in a somewhat complex sense, is beyond the personalities of its elements. That personality is real for us; for when we assume its truth, the assumption leads to concrete differences in life.

If this be true, there are within the state enough of these monistic entities, club, trade-union, church, society, town, county, each with a group-life, a group-idea, each, in Gierke's phrase, a *gesammt*-person, a group-person, to enrich the imagination. Yet, he tells us, the state itself, the society of which they form part, is mysteriously One above them. "All Manyness has its origin in Oneness, and to Oneness it returns." So we are to obey that One, to think of the Manyness as superficial, as appearance. The state is to enjoy perpetual benediction, is to be one and indivisible. Trade-unionists and capitalists alike must surrender the interests of their smaller and antithetic group-persons to the larger demands of the One, the state. You are first part of the One, America; only in secondary fashion do you belong to church or class or club. In the One differences become harmonized, disappear; there are no rich or poor, Protestant or Catholic, Republican or Democrat, but only Americans. The greatest of persons takes all others to itself. "All Manyness has its origin in Oneness and to Oneness it returns."

In some such way may be described the monistic theory of the state. It is a theory of which the importance may not be minimized at a time when the "exclusive state" has made war to assert its exclusiveness. We must, so we are told, admit that of necessity all parts of the state are woven together to make a harmonious whole. The state is to political science what the Absolute is to metaphysics. The unity is logically necessary, for, were there independence even in a single group, that group could never act upon another. Independence, as Lotze argued, must mean impenetrability; yet nothing is so obvious as the supreme fact of mutual influence. Pluralism in an ultimate political sense is, therefore, impossible, for it would make unintelligible any rational interpretation of society.

Certain implications of this doctrine are worth while noting before we attempt any criticism of it. Clearly, just as in metaphysics we can condemn the world as a whole, or praise it as a whole, so must the state be bad or good as a totality. It cannot be good and bad in its parts. Pessimistic or optimistic you may be in regard to it, but meliorstic you have no right to feel so far as the state is concerned. For that which distinguishes your state must be implied also in its parts, however various; and an evil part is evil, whether it be capitalist or agitator, only if the state as a totality is evil. We bridge over, in fact, the distinction between good and bad, between right and wrong. It is due only to the limitation of our finite political intelligence. It is not, so to speak, in the "state-in-itself." It is only the appearance below which we must penetrate if we would grasp political reality. That is why Mr. Bradley can regard his absolute—for us the state—as the richer for every disharmony; for that seeming pain is in truth but a minister to joy.

Such an attitude seems of but remote utility in practical politics. In fact, we have to deem acts right and wrong. We do point to groups within the state and urge that they are really harmful and really beneficent. We have to take what may be appearance as actually constituting reality, and judge accordingly. We credit, in short, human knowledge. We say that there is something in experience. If we cannot credit it, assuredly there is nothing in which credence is at all possible. Even Treitzschke and Hegel put their personal trust in State and Absolute. And if this human experience is at all worthy of trust, let us freely admit that it is finite. We cannot know all things. We have to be content with a certain specialism, leaving universality to the Absolute.

Applying this line of reasoning to politics, I mean that we do not proceed from the state to the parts of the state, from the One to the Many, on the ground that the state is more unified than its parts; on the contrary, I contend that the parts are as real and as self-sufficing as the whole. Independence precedes Confederation. I do not know the United States before I know, say, New York and Albany; it is from Albany and New York that I come to know the United States. Of course, the knowledge of them will lead to a knowledge of the Republic simply because there is logical relation between them. But, in James's phrase, "everything you can think of, however vast or inclusive, has, on the pluralistic view, a genuinely 'external' environment, of some sort or amount . . . the pluralistic world is thus more like a federal republic than like an empire or a kingdom. However much may be collected, however much may report itself as present at any effective centre of consciousness or action, something else is self-governed and absent and unreduced to unity."

I am urging that in the state, because a group or an individual is related to some other group or individual, he is not thereby forced to enter into relations with every other part of the body politic. When a trade-union ejects one of its members for refusing to pay a political levy, it is not thereby bungling itself into relation with the Anglican church. A trade-union as such has no connection with the Anglican church; it stands self-sufficient, on its own legs. It is, it may be, in relations with the state, a part of it; but it is not one with it. It may work with the state, but of necessity it need not do so. The state, in James's terms, is distributive and not collective; there are no essential connections among its parts.

I am not taking up the position that the state has no relations with its parts. We are simply denying that the parts must be judged by the state, the individual German, let us say, by the conduct of Germany. We have not to judge of all things in their state-context. Such a relation is a forced

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relation. It is charging to the account or credit of A things which are really accountable or creditable to B. We judge, that is to say, the success or failure of trade-unionism by reference to itself, and not by reference to the state of which it is part. In the monistic theory of the state trade-unionism derives its meaning from its relations; in the pluralistic theory, while the relations may be of the deepest importance, they are not its whole meaning. So in the pluralist view of the state there are, as James pointed out, real losses and real losers in the clashing of its parts; nor do they add mysteriously to the splendor of the whole.

The value of this attitude lies simply in this, that it does fit the facts. It renders unnecessary the tediously elaborate gymnastic of working out the respective spheres of state and individual. For the pluralist, there is no meaning in that antithesis. The state is not opposed to the individual simply because, in the essential context, the individual is part of the state. The state is one of the groups to which he belongs. There is no more significance in Herbert Spencer's "Man Versus the State" than there would be if a distinguished physiologist wrote a treatise on the body versus the liver. All thought, moreover, of the state as an organism must, on this view, be surrendered. That the state is an organization to which each of its members belongs is, of course, evident without further argument; but the characteristics of an organism cannot, as has been pointed out almost to surfeit by a host of writers, be predicated of an organization in which the will of the parts is real and independent, and where there may be passive resistance to the decree of the "social sensorium" as in the case of the English Nonconformists, and active resistance as in the case of the Ulster Unionists. We must, too, admit that the members of the state are bound to it in varying degrees at different times; there is within and without it, that is to say, a conflict of demands. In the event of a great war, for example, you may, as a member of the state, be called upon to fight; as a member of another group, the Quakers, you may be called upon to refuse the demand. It seems clear that little or nothing is gained by talk of "overriding demands," of saying, for instance, that the demands of the state are all-important. The history of societies so fatally contradicts that view as to make it of little use. Everything will depend on the intensity of the belief with which the demand of the state comes into conflict. To those who argue that such antagonism endangers the life of the state —as when Germany regards the Ulster problem as putting Great Britain out of court— I can only reply that in all probability such marginal cases will be rare; but there is no guarantee, so far as I can conceive, that they will not occur.

Where in such a theory, it will be asked, is sovereignty? Everything here depends upon what is meant by that ill-fated term. In the Austinian sense, it is clear that no such thing as sovereignty exists at all. No instrument exists in the state with the absolute assurance that any rule of conduct will be enforced, for that rule of conduct will depend for its enforcement on the members of the state, and in the event of a sufficiently powerful minority refusing to obey, the rule is simply worthless as a command. If, for example, Parliament now chose to disband the trade-unions, it would certainly fail to carry the statute into effect. We have, therefore, to define sovereignty in a sense that is very different from the Austinian conception. We seem to find its essence not in the coercion that will follow from a failure to obey its command, but from the inconvenience that will result from opposition to it. The members of the state agree to obey the decrees of government simply because those decrees are infused with good will and because, without such agreed submission, the state, like any other group, becomes impotent and impossible. The minority agrees to accept the verdict of a majority not because the majority has the power to enforce it, but simply because the "idea" of a group cannot be realized if every dissension means a secession. Sovereignty at bottom is not legal at all, but a practical convenience of which the underlying fictional nature is quite likely, on occasion, to be demonstrated.

There is nothing in all this, I believe, at all incompatible with the view of modern constitutional authority. "The principle of Parliamentary authority," writes Professor Dicey, "means neither more nor less than this, namely, that Parliament . . . has, under the English Constitution, the right to make or unmake any law whatever; and, further, that no person or body is recognized by the law of England as having the right to override or set aside the legislation of Parliament." But the law of England is no more than a body of rules agreed to as of practical convenience. It is a sovereignty situate in Parliament by consent, and that consent is, as I have pointed out, liable to suspension. Groups or individuals will admit it only to the point where admission does not conflict with their moral sense. Legal sovereignty, in short, represents, politically, an obstruction of the facts.

What guarantee, then, have we in the pluralist view, that the will of the state shall in fact prevail? It may seem that this view gives a handle to anarchy. Well, I cannot help that. It does not, I believe, give any greater handle to anarchy than it already possesses. If we become inductive-minded, and look at the facts of social life, it is, I think, tolerably evident that when we talk of wills, we mean wills not to do just as much as wills to do. The guarantee that the will of the state is going to prevail depends largely on the persons who interpret that will. The monarchs of the *ancien régime* were legally the sovereign power in France, but their will was not the will of the state. It did not prevail simply because of the supreme unwisdom of the manner in which they chose to identify its good with their own. They confused what Rousseau would have called their "private good" with the "common good," and Louis XVI paid the penalty on the scaffold. The will of the state obtains preëminence over the wills of other groups exactly to the point at which it is interpreted with sufficient wisdom to obtain general assent, and no further. It is a will largely competing with other wills, and, Darwin-wise, surviving only by its ability to cope with its environment. Should it venture into dangerous places, it pays the penalty of its audacity. It finds its sovereignty by consent transformed into impotence by disagreement.

But, it may be objected, in such a view sovereignty means no more than the ability to secure assent. I can only reply to the objection by admitting it. There is no sanction for law other than the consent of the human mind. It is sheer illusion to imagine that the authority of the state has any other safeguard than the wills of its members. For the state, as I have tried to show, is simply what Mr. Graham Wallas calls a Will-Organization, and its essential feature is its ultimate dependence upon the constituent wills from which the group-will is made. To argue—as doubtless German theorists would argue—that the state is degraded by such a reduction in nowise alters the fact that here lies the essence of its nature. We have only to look at the realities of social existence to see that the state does not enjoy any necessary preëminence for its commands. Again and again my allegiance may be divided between the different groups to which I belong. The state has to fight hard to maintain my allegiance.

A view of this kind, I would urge, gives us a positive theory of its meaning and function. The state is an organized group actuated by a particular idea, and men belong to it because they believe in the goodness of that idea. There is not, as I conceive, any fundamental difference, except in degree, between the nature of a state and the nature of a baseball club. What are the fundamental attributes of a baseball club? Primarily, of course, it exists to play baseball matches; but the organization of it is entrusted to directors whose function is regard for its well-being. The secondary object of the club is to win the baseball matches that it plays. To that end the directors engage the best players they can find; they do all things which, in their judgment, will tend to secure the club's success. For what they do they are responsible to the shareholders of the club who pass judgment on the success or failure of their efforts.

I think that in the case of the state something differing only in degree from what happens in the case of a baseball club will be found to occur. The club is the state; the directors are the government. The object of government is a positive object; it is to attain the end—whatever it be—of the state. For that end it must adopt, just as the baseball directors adopt, the means most likely to lead to success. The members of the state will, in democratic countries at least, periodically pass judgment upon its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy. It will be a judgment based on the degree to which that policy has attained its end. The members will conceive the state as entitled to ask from them the means to attain their endeavor. Further than this they will not go, and, throughout, they must, as a rule, be in sympathy with that endeavor. There are things a state will not demand, because it cannot. And when the members of the state find the proceedings of its directors uninteresting they turn aside from the study of or participation in such pursuits. They become interested in other things—we say that "politics is dead." A "united Germany" only means that the vivid interest of that group's proceedings transcends for the time being the interest of all other groups.

A view of this kind runs directly counter to the German theories of the state—at any rate, to the dominant theories of that country. It is, I believe, the natural consequence of Gierke's realism, the recognition that personality is the result of collective action and the denial that such personality is the fictional derivative of the state. It gives no peculiar merit to that group, does not, for example, admit that its thirst for power is a moral aim superior to that of other groups. That question has a peculiar interest at the present time. The assertion that power is good involves the question, Good for what? I assume that the reply is that power is good, first, for personal security, and, secondly, to spread a cultural superiority. But to the first there is the question of extent: What power is needed for security? A state may, as Machiavelli said, "go to work against charity and faith and humanity and religion." How long, in that event, will it retain the affection of its citizens? And, as to the spread of its culture, it would have to prove that its dominance can only be maintained by force of arms. It would have to be shown that, in fact, the means adopted are likely to secure the end proposed. It would have to obtain and retain the faith of its members in that superiority. And, what is perhaps not the least important consideration, it would have to win.

The state, then, is a democratic federation. Its personality consists in the "idea" underlying its existence, its value in the good that "idea" can achieve. Men will cling to it so long as it strives honestly for their well-being, so long as it asks them for the sake of their fellows to serve freely and fully in gladness. Assuredly no observer who has any care for truth will deny that in a state where such opportunity is most largely given the attainment will be big and rich and splendid. Only in such wise can the life of the state be full. Its activities will be stimulated by the work of other groups coextensive with or complementary to itself. It will issue no challenge, as it will claim no preëminence. What it is and what affection it secures it will be and obtain by virtue of its achievement. So only can it hope to hand on undimmed the torch of its conscious life.

Book Notes and Byways

THE "CROWNING" OF STATIUS.

By EDMUND KEMPER BROADUS.

The recent appearance of a compilation of lives of the poets-laureate* contributes another instance of the curious misconception which has prevailed time out of mind in regard to the "crowning" or laureation of the Roman poet, Statius. Says Mr. Gray (p. 2): "In ancient Greece the laurel was sacred to Apollo, and those who had courted the Muses most successfully were crowned with a wreath made from its leaves. Besides perpetuating this practice, the Romans invested the ceremony of laureation with more pomp and splendour. Domitian, for example, when he attended the Alban contests, himself placed a chaplet on the heads of those competitors who had won distinction in music or poetry. One of the last acts of this Emperor was to present the bays to his court poet Statius, as the prize of a 'music and gymnastic' contest."

It is, perhaps, a minor matter that the chaplets given as prizes in the late Roman poetical contests were not of laurel (as Mr. Gray implies), but of oak, ivy, or olive leaves; but the statement that "one of the last acts" of Domitian was "to present the bays to his court poet, Statius, as the prize of a 'music and gymnastic' contest," is a blunder of some importance, and one which could have been avoided by the most cursory investigation. The phrase "'music and gymnastic' contest," which the writer borrows from Suetonius, identifies the contest as that of the Capitoline Games†; the phrase, "one of the last acts of this Emperor" points to the third *Agon Capitolinus* (the only one in which Statius took part), which occurred only a short time before the nearly concurrent deaths of the Emperor and his court poet.

So far, so good. But this third *Agon* is of historical interest, not because Domitian presented the bays to Statius, but precisely because Domitian grievously disappointed his court poet by conferring the coveted chaplet of oak leaves upon another competitor. In his youth Statius had won prizes (olive wreaths and golden crowns) in the Alban contests, and, now that he had finished his "Thebaid," had every expectation of winning the more notable reward upon the Capitoline. Embittered at his disappointment, he declares ("Silvæ," III, 5) his intention of leaving Rome forever, and of living henceforth in his birthplace, Naples. The poem takes the form of an address, half querulous, half pathetic, to his wife, Claudia, whom he seeks to comfort for her prospective exile from the metropolis.

"When my brow," he says, "was bright with the Alban wreath and Cæsar's golden chaplet was on my head, it was you who clasped me to your heart, and showered breathless kisses on my laurels. It was you, when the Capitol disdained my lays, you who shared my defeat and fretted with me at the ingratitude and cruelty of love. You with wakeful ears snatch the first essays of my melodies and those nights of whispering; you who alone share the secret of my long, long toil, and with the years of your love my Thebaid has grown to full stature" ("The Silvæ of Statius," trans. D. A. Slater; Oxford, 1908).

It would hardly be worth while to point out an error of this sort in a perfunctory compilation such as Mr. Gray's "Poets Laureate of England," were it not that the blunder which he repeats has had a rather interesting history. The early biographers of the laureates (Austin and Ralph, London, 1853, and Walter Hamilton, London, 1879), from whom Gray borrows extensively in his chapter on the laureate tradition, both fall into the same error; and such careful scholars as Prof. James Harvey Robinson and Prof. Henry Winchester Rolfe, in their "Petrarch" (New York, 1898, p. 104), make the double mistake of assuming that Statius was "crowned" upon the Capitoline, and that he was "the first to gain that honour."

But these are only by the way. The mistake made by Robinson and Rolfe points the way to the *locus classicus* of the error—Petrarch's double blunder in supposing that Statius was one of a long succession of poets to be thus crowned upon the Capitoline, and that he was the last poet before Petrarch himself to be thus honored ("Recolo . . . in hoc ipso capitolio romano ubi nunc insistimus tot tantosque vates ad culmen preclari magisterii provectos emeritam lauream reportasse . . . post statium pampineum illustrem poetam qui domitiani temporibus floruit nullum legimus tali honore decoratum." Hortis, "Scritti Inediti," p. 316).

The Capitoline Games were established in 86 A. D. We learn from Martial that a certain Collinus was the first to win the coveted chaplet: "O Collinus, to whom it has been granted to obtain the crown of oak in the Capitol, and to surround thy deserving locks with its foliage first of all thy race, make the most, if thou art wise, of every day, and always imagine that thy last has come" ("Epigrams," IV, liv, Bohn Clas. Lib.). Statius, as we have seen, did not compete at this or at the second contest, and was an unsuccessful competitor at the third. The Capitoline Games were continued for a considerable period after Domitian's death, a twelve-year-old boy, for example, being "coronatus" in the year 106.

The explicit information concerning Statius's early successes and late disappointment, which may be derived from the "Silvæ," was, of course, inaccessible to Petrarch, the manuscript of that collection of occasional poems not having been discovered by Poggio until some time after Petrarch's death; and, in any event, vagueness as to the biographical side of pagan history was typical of the period. Dante, for example, through a confusion of identity, gives Statius's birthplace as Toulouse.

The importance which Petrarch attached to the precedent (as he supposed) of Statius's "coronation" was by no means accidental. The "Thebaid" is one of the few purely literary products of pagan Rome interest in which seems to have persisted throughout the Middle Ages. And this, apparently, not because of its literary merit, but because of the curious tradition that Statius was, in fact, a Christian poet. How explicit that tradition was is attested by Dante, who in the twenty-

*"The Poets Laureate of England," by W. Forbes Gray. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $2.50 net.

†"He (Domitian) likewise instituted in honour of Jupiter Capitolinus a solemn contest in music . . . and gymnastic exercises. . . . There was also a public performance in elocution, both Greek and Latin." (Suetonius, "Lives of the Cæsars," Domitian. Trans., Bohn Clas. Lib.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

second canto of the "Purgatorio" even essays to fix the time of Statius's baptism; and, thanks to that ceremony, releases Statius from Purgatory, while Virgil himself and the

Greeks who of old their brows with laurel decked

are condemned to remain in Limbo. Dante believed that Statius had been decorated at Rome with the poet's crown, although the chaplet accorded to him is not of laurel, but of the lesser myrtle. Doubtless Dante conceived of this "concealed Christian"* as the first baptized follower of the new faith to win the ancient pagan honor, and Dante's own aspiration to win the laurel wreath, curiously blended as it is of Christian piety and reverence for pagan usage, seems to associate itself in a measure with Statius's example. "For its sake" (*i. e.*, for the sake of Dante's service to the faith), St. Peter had thrice crowned the poet; and the closing lines of the twenty-fourth canto of the "Paradiso" and the opening lines of the twenty-fifth, after describing that celestial ceremony, set forth Dante's longing for the terrestrial crown. But the earthly wreath must be a recognition of his services both to heaven and to the muses. The ceremony must be in his native city, that "fair sheep-fold" whence he had been expelled, but it must not be in court or public square. "If it ever happen that the sacred poem to which heaven and earth have so set hand, that it has made me lean for many years, should overcome the cruelty which bars me out of the fair sheep-fold, where a lamb I slept, foe to the wolves that give it war; then with other voice, with other fleece, a Poet will I return, and on the font of my baptism will I take the crown; because there I entered into the Faith which makes the souls known to God; and afterward Peter, for its sake, thus encircled my brow" ("Paradiso," Can. XXV, 1-12, trans. Norton).

Dante was not destined to receive the earthly honor which he craved; but when Petrarch achieved that goal of his high ambition (not, however, without scheming for it with true Italian diplomacy), he had, like Dante, the precedent of Statius in the very forefront of his consciousness. Petrarch, it is true, was too thoroughly imbued with the new spirit to emphasize, or perhaps even to think of, the Christianity of the ancient poet who had, as Petrarch supposed, won the chaplet upon the Capitoline; but, thanks to Dante, Statius had become a peculiarly significant figure, and it is Statius and no other whom Petrarch names as the illustrious precedent. And possibly Petrarch's own mistake as to Statius's "coronation" was due to a wrong inference from Dante's phrase in introducing that poet: "So sweet was the spirit of my voice," Dante makes Statius say, "that me of Toulouse† Rome drew to herself, where I earned the right to adorn my temples with myrtle" ("Purgatorio," XXI, 88-90, trans. Norton).

The point is, after all, perhaps, but a minor one. No doubt the Italian of the Renaissance, with his minute interest, not only in the literature, but also in the customs of ancient Rome, his academies "for promoting the adoption of antique customs into modern life,"* and his feeling that in so doing he was renewing the golden age, would have appropriated this fine old pagan custom without the intervention of the Statian tradition. We know, in fact, that there were instances of laureation well before Dante's day; for St. Bonaventura (*Legenda S. Francisci, Opera,* VII, 280) tells us that one of the earliest converts which St. Francis made to his order was a certain inventor of secular songs (sæcularium cantionum curiosus inventor) who had been crowned by the Emperor (Frederic II, in his court at Naples), and was known as the King of Verse; but such instances were rare and spasmodic. The peculiar and factitious importance which Statius had to the mediæval reader, the new lease of life which Dante's emphasis in the "Divina Commedia" gave to him, and the explicit reference made by Petrarch on the occasion of his own "coronation," all contribute to make of Statius a sort of connecting link between the pagan custom and the efflorescence of laureation at the time of the Renaissance.

John Addington Symonds has written that "the ancient and the modern eras met together at the Capitol at Petrarch's coronation," and in no respect is this more curiously illustrated than in the part played by this traditionally Christian author of pagan epics in furnishing a precedent (albeit a mistaken one) for the renewal of the pagan ceremony of laureation.

*See the elaborate and ingenious, if not altogether convincing, study of Dante's conception of Statius's religious belief in A. W. Verrall's "To Follow the Fisherman" and "Dante and the Baptism of Statius." ("Essays," Cambridge, 1913, pp. 152 ff.)

†Chaucer, in "The Hous of Fame," retains this error as to the birthplace of Statius:

"The Tholosan that highte Stace."

*Symonds, "Revival of Learning," p. 361.

Correspondence.

THE "NATION."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: As a reader of the *Nation* for more than thirty years, I congratulate you most heartily on the fine jubilee number. It is in every way worthy of the splendid traditions of the paper.

To-day, as in the days of Godkin, the *Nation's* editorials must rouse the civic consciousness of the college youth of America and stimulate them to independent thought and action in their relation to the pressing problems of these times.

May it continue for many generations to inspire and to guide those from whose ranks some of the future leaders of the country will surely come. Julian W. Mack.

Chicago, July 10.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I wish to extend hearty congratulations concerning your semi-centennial number recently received.

I became a subscriber to the *Nation* in 1865, when I was seventeen years of age, and have been a continuous reader and subscriber from the first number to the present time. I treasure very much the complete file which I possess of this paper. It has taught me valuable lessons, and its reading has indeed been an education.

The cogent "King's English" of Mr. Godkin has never been surpassed in strength, virility, and beauty by any American journalist. To me he was an inspiration, especially for the cause of civil-service reform. My interest in this cause (witnessed by an active membership in the Executive Committee of the Civil Service Reform Association of Pennsylvania for over thirty years past) was largely due to the stirring appeals and vigorous battle waged by Mr. Godkin against the spoils system.

A fine photograph of this leader of men looks down upon me from my office wall, and is a constant reminder of a great spirit supremely dedicated to the cause of civic righteousness and administrative reform. And then, too, Mr. Garrison's thorough (in the fullest sense of that full word) conduct and management of the literary work and book reviews of the paper in my judgment has never been surpassed, and it is indeed very doubtful whether it ever will be. His work as shown in the files of the paper is his greatest monument.

I need not say that I read your semi-centennial number with absorbing, almost fascinated, interest. It certainly reminded me of the old days of the *Nation* to read the contributions from some of the first pillars of its early building.

May it long continue to be (as it always has been) a great force and influence in its chosen field. James G. Francis.

Philadelphia, July 12.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I offer my felicitations to the *Nation* on its jubilee, and on its jubilee number.

These are bleak days for any kind of rejoicing; but the one thing left to cheer us is the tone of our best American newspapers and periodicals. Such an editorial as that on "German-American 'Misunderstandings,'" in the jubilee number of the *Nation,* should be enough to persuade the world that we are not the facile dupes that Germany pleases to think us. Agnes Repplier.

Salem, Mass., July 13.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I thank you for my perusal of your impressive semi-centennial number.

It is hard to express one's sense of the peculiar human valuation of that fifty years' record of public service which hides its still ruddy virility, with a certain reticence, behind that staid black-and-white of the long-established format. Nothing of the futuristic here, yet much of the cherishable future in the justly cherished past—a future and a past which, to one who loves the destiny and history of his country, give to the present a kind of majestic assurance of the vitality and authenticity of American idealism.

There are, and will be, numerous tenets of faith, political, literary, artistic, upon which I, as an individual, differ with the *Nation.* What individual may not do so? The iris-hues of futurism which flaunt their bloom from many a more colorful journal have for me, on occasions, their fascinating shades and values. Yet, passing from occasional choices to a sense of continuity with that great living tradition of America, which has thrilled not once but again and again to the call of "Emancipation," the vast current of those fifty years, whose stormy sky and landscapes lie so quietly mirrored in the *Nation,* bears me on, I confess, with a kind of exultance in being a bubble on so cosmic a stream.

In several articles of your anniversary number, it is pertinently observed that the character of the *Nation* has been moulded by the characters of its successive editors. Its success has been that these characters have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves been plastic (with whatever individual limitations) to the mysterious creative forces of their time, mightier than themselves.

The Garrison-Godkin editorial tradition has stamped its historic pages, but history itself has stamped its editors. If I may make a comparison from the traditions of my own profession, the editorial sway of the *Nation* over its public has likeness to the sway of certain eminent producers of the theatre over *their* public. The total reportory influence of Henry Irving and Ellen Terry, though stamped with the genius of Terry and Irving, lives on by virtue of a genius larger than theirs—the genius of their audiences, the begetters of a new age. So, too, the house of Wallack flourished by a coöperation, in which that worthy American producer was a distinctive yet only a partial influence.

It is, then, a pleasant privilege, sir, to be able to felicitate you on your fifty years' celebration without being too personal; for, in wishing you joy of your golden wedding, I beg also to felicitate your loyal (if not always accountable) copartner—the American public.

PERCY MACKAYE.

Cornish, N. H., July 8.

PROFESSOR USHER'S "PAN-AMERICANISM."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me sufficient space to point out an erroneous use of words in your recent review of my "Pan-Americanism"? The review is headed "The Vaticinations of Professor Usher." The reviewer declares that "the volume is expressly announced as a prediction"; says that "neither the author on his title page nor the publishers in their advertisements have left anything undone to produce the impression that the prophecy is both definite and sensational"—the reference is to the sub-title, A Forecast of the Inevitable Clash Between the United States and Europe's Victor—that the inevitable clash refers to "our future war with Europe."

It is, however, an error to suppose that the word forecast is synonymous with the words vaticination, prophecy, foretelling, or that the word clash connotes the same meaning as conflict or war. There seems, indeed, to be but one usage sanctioned by authority. "Prophecy connotes inspired or mysterious knowledge or great assurance of prediction." It will hardly be denied that the reviewer's and editor's intention was to say that I had claimed on the title page such knowledge and assurance. The mention of the tripod places this beyond doubt, and the content of the review as a whole confirms it. The authority just quoted distinguishes forecast from prophecy as "conjecture rather than inference," while others define it as discernment beforehand, foresight of consequences, estimate of future happenings. Indeed, the word was chosen in order to disown any intention of predicting or foretelling, and in the hope of avoiding the inference that any certainty was claimed for any future happenings or that one probability discussed was more likely than another.

That the book itself produces this impression, your reviewer states with clearness; indeed, he cannot conceal his surprise that a book announced as a prophecy from the tripod should not contain definite prognostications. Mr. Usher, he says, "permits his book to be advertised in the most sensational manner as containing explicit and startling predictions; he himself incorporates such predictions in his title and chapter headings; yet, in fact, he for the most part avoids choosing between alternative possibilities, and for nearly every event that he prognosticates, prognosticates also its opposite." I attempted to make clear my intentions in the preface: "to analyze, to discuss, and to examine . . . to treat so vital and controversial a subject objectively and with detachment . . . this has been my object." This I still believe to be not at variance with the accepted usage of the word forecast, and to differ widely from the common usage of prophecy and vaticination.

Did not the reviewer's difficulty lie in his original assumption that the book was meant to be a prophecy? Do not the majority of his remarks proceed directly from this assumption and depend upon its correctness for their validity?

A similar failure to apprehend the meaning of the word clash led to equally serious results. The assumption that it connoted armed conflict caused the reviewer to misunderstand many important phrases and passages, raised up hobgoblins and spectres, which were both absurd and ridiculous, and so colored the statements in the book as to render many nonsensical and improbable. Clash is defined as an interference, a disagreement, an "opposition as between differing or conflicting interests, views, purposes, etc." It was employed precisely because no reputable authority seemed to sanction its usage in the sense of armed conflict or the use of force. The book was intended to lead the reader to the conclusion that the use of force by us or against us seemed to me improbable, though possible, but that an opposition of interests and views with the victor seemed inevitable and would raise many and difficult issues, including those of armament and disarmament.

As the *Nation* in its review of my "Pan-Germanism" scouted the existence of Pan-Germanism itself as one of the wildest of imaginative speculations, a difference of opinion between the *Nation* and myself on issues of present international politics seems literally inevitable, but I should prefer that it should be due to deeper causes than the usage of words.

ROLAND G. USHER.

Washington University, St. Louis, July 14.

[We regret that we were betrayed into attributing to Professor Usher a greater degree of inspiration than was his due.—ED. THE NATION.]

A QUESTION OF CONTEXT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: *Quousque tandem!* Another exhibition of that curious mentality with which we in this country have become tolerably familiar since early in August last and with which we are destined to become more and more conversant, no doubt, as long as Germany's defenders persist in flooding us with the bright but unbearable light of their boundless and superior knowledge. The latest torch-bearer to appear in the *Nation* (July 1) is Mr. Jacques Mayer, of Munich. The science of misquotation, the art of irrational deduction, combined with the practice of inconsequential logic, misinterpretation of attested facts, and misconstruction of the plainest texts, have seldom if ever been carried to a higher degree of perfection than they have been since the appearance of that precious brochure "The Truth About Germany." Mr. Mayer is simply following in the wake of the great and near great of his own land, when he cites Cramb in such an unfortunate but to him eminently satisfactory manner. One ought not to be surprised then, when on turning to Cramb's work to verify the quotation, one finds the first part of Mr. Mayer's citation on page 49 (E. P. Dutton's edition, 1914), and the second part, "So long, etc.," on page 16. Whatever be the true explanation of this inversion, it is a small matter, whether intentional or inadvertent. What is much more serious is the error into which apparently Mr. Mayer permitted himself to be led by his earnestness and strong convictions. He appears to believe, or intends that his readers shall believe, that he is quoting what was Professor Cramb's own personal opinion of England and of what she really is. In his all-consuming zeal Mr. Mayer seems to have given only a cursory attention to the context of both his quotations. Or is he deliberately misstating? At any rate, from a moderately careful perusal of Cramb's text the reader cannot but become aware that Cramb, far from giving to his fellow-countrymen in these words his own personal opinion or that of any other Englishman or Englishmen, was really giving what he conceived to be the opinion in regard to England prevalent at that moment in German circles.

W. A. MCLAUGHLIN.

Ann Arbor, Mich., July 3.

DR. CONYBEARE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue for July 15, Dr. Conybeare writes from Oxford on June 29 explaining that he had been "over-hasty" in charging Sir Edward Grey with responsibility for the war. But on the front page of the same number there is an advertisement of the *Open Court* for July, in which an extract is given from an article by Dr. Conybeare, still making his charges against Sir Edward Grey. The advertisement (for which, of course, Dr. Conybeare is not responsible) is headed: "How one man's personal grudge has cost one million lives." It is also said that the article was originally sent to an English publishing agency and declined.

Which is the true view of Dr. Conybeare? It is natural to assume that this is to be found in his letter from Oxford, dated June 29. If so, we may rightly ask Dr. Paul Carus not to allow his pro-German partiality to prevent him from making the necessary correction in the August number of his magazine.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

Toronto, July 15.

[Dr. Conybeare's letter naturally expresses his revised judgment. Had the advertisement been brought to the attention of the editors, it would not have appeared.—ED. THE NATION.]

"THE BREAKDOWN OF INTERNATIONALISM."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The possibility, or otherwise, of Internationalism seems to me to depend on a question of personality.

Euclid tells us that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts, but it is equally true that the whole is often quite different from the sum of its parts. We ourselves, for in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stance, are made up of many millions of cells, each living its own life and quite unconscious of the whole of which it forms a part, yet depending largely for its welfare on the actions of that whole, over which it has, however, little or no control.

Now, if the analogy holds, and we are each of us, while living our own lives, parts of a higher individuality—a nation, the real superman—Internationalism is an impossible dream, for we cannot really influence that higher personality; still less can we destroy it. But if the analogy does not hold, if a nation is an Idea, if its character is a kind of resultant of the character of its component individualities, Internationalism is possible, for one idea can be replaced by another.

In spite of the fact that the character of the German nation seems, unhappily, very different from that of the Germans I know—they do not, however, belong to the ruling classes of that country—I believe that nations are ideal existences and that Internationalism has a future. We have simply got to think in terms of humanity rather than in terms of nationality, and the latter idea will gradually fade away. But if such a change be desirable, patriotism is not a virtue, but a vice.

RICHARD KAY.

Hartland, N. Devon, July 1.

Notes from Two Capitals

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

By SIR HENRY LUCY.

The ex-First Lord of the Admiralty is not the first of his name to break up a powerful Ministry because he could not have his own way at a particular turn of affairs. Lord Randolph Churchill's son is, like his father, as headstrong as he is capable. He found his match in "Jack" Fisher. Suave in manner, modest in estimation of his own qualities, the late First Sea Lord, once driven into an attitude of resentment, is an exceedingly tough person to deal with. Naturally gratified when amid national plaudits "the dropped pilot" was, when war broke out, picked up again, he gave himself up heart and soul to administering the affairs of the navy he had created. All went well for some months, the success of the navy in casual encounters with the enemy and in the great task of keeping sea-room open for itself and its Allies testifying to the unity of capable direction at headquarters. Unfortunately, hereditary instinct asserting itself with his chief, Lord Fisher, believing his appointed domain was being systematically encroached upon, cut the painter. The Admiralty barge got hopelessly adrift, and before he quite knew where he was the Prime Minister found added to overwhelming duties and responsibilities the task of re-forming his Ministry.

Winston Churchill entered the House of Commons handicapped by the circumstance common to several members of the present Parliament, fatal to most of them, of being the son of a father illustrious in Parliamentary record. The younger and the older Pitt form a rare, perhaps unique, example where such accidental connection proved no obstacle to the triumphant progress of the son. Winston would be the last man to claim equality with his father, who died too early to justify expectation raised by supreme, statesmanlike qualities occasionally obscured by brilliant guerrilla tactics. We get only one Randolph Churchill in a century. To old friends the son in many ways recalls the presence of the father. He does not resemble him in facial appearance, but has many mannerisms startlingly reminiscent. Designedly or unconsciously, he addresses the House of Commons in the same attitude Lord Randolph assumed when, with open hands resting on hips, feet set well apart, and head bent forward, he worried Stafford Northcote, or with the confidence that shone on the countenance of David when he went forth to fight Goliath, he girded at Gladstone.

More important resemblances between father and son are their capacity for work, their intuitive grasp of a question, their lucidity and force of speech. While he was still a private member it was noted that when Winston rose to speak on whatsoever subject, whether it was Fiscal Reform, War Office Administration, or the Aliens Bill, he had mastered all the bearings of the case, carefully thought out their ramifications. His set speeches were even at this early time admirable contributions to debate. Even better, more immediately effective, were his remarks in the give-and-take discussion of Committee, or his interjected questions addressed to the Minister in charge of the business before the House.

Inheriting the rich gift of memory with which Lord Randolph was endowed, he is accustomed to write out his set speeches, learn them off by heart, and declaim them to a listening Senate. This habit on one occasion led to disastrous consequence. Nearing the end of a luminous address, recited with an ease and fluency that obscured the secret of the manuscript, he, towards the conclusion, lost his cue. He could not remember how the ultimate sentence of his speech was framed. After struggling for some moments he gave up the attempt, abruptly resuming his seat, his speech unfinished.

That was an accident inseparable from the method. A rarer and more precious gift in House of Commons debate enables a member to express in two or three pointed sentences a weak or a strong point observed as in a flash of lightning. Winston Churchill possesses that gift and improves it with daily practice.

It was characteristic of the statesman who, by a flash of grim humor, has upon the reconstruction of the Ministry been relegated to the obscure sinecure of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, that he should first present himself in the House of Commons as critic of an important measure introduced by the Government under whose flag he had won election at Oldham. The war in South Africa being in full blast, Mr. Brodrick, called upon to save the State, formulated a scheme of army reform warranted to avert repetition of catastrophe at the moment threatening the existence of the army and the stability of the Empire. The young member for Oldham, who had the advantage over the Secretary of State for War of having smelt powder and heard bullets whizz on more than one stricken field, sharply criticised it. He did more. One of a small minority, he went into the division lobby to record his vote against it. Two years later, further consideration of the Brodrick scheme resulting in general condemnation, organized attack was made upon it. As many as nineteen Ministerialists backed their hostile opinion by a vote in the Opposition lobby. With the young member for Oldham, fresh to the Parliamentary arena, lay the double credit of shrewd insight into the real value of the portentous plan when first introduced with the blare of trumpets and the rattle of drums, and of courage in testifying to conviction by his vote.

This was an ominous launching of a promising bark. A steady stream of circumstance finally drifted it into the sea of Liberalism. Winston's constitutional independence, his blunt honesty, unfitted him for companionship with the well-drilled Parliamentary ranks of Conservatism. Nevertheless, had Mr. Balfour thought it worth while to have given his mind to the task, he might have captured and retained one who later became the lion cub of a Liberal Cabinet. From the first he openly resented the indiscipline of the son of his early comrade of Fourth Party days. The more he was snubbed, the more intractable Winston became.

Early in the session of 1904, when the long predominant Unionist Government was staggering to a fall, a motion for the adjournment was made from the Opposition side with intent to give them a helping knock on the head. It was Lloyd George who led the irregular attack. By coincidence—strange, in view of the close relationship established between the two young Cabinet Ministers under the Premiership of Mr. Asquith—Winston Churchill, still seated on the Ministerial side, rose to second the motion. Immediately, at a concerted signal, the shocked Ministerialists jumped up and with one accord left the House. They were prepared with more or less unconcern to sit out an attack on the Government opened from the enemy's camp. It is the business of the Opposition to oppose. When the assault was joined in by one from their own ranks, they marked their resentment of what they regarded as treachery by shaking the dust of the matted floor from off their feet.

That was the beginning of an inevitable end. Two months and a day later, Winston Churchill, sauntering in from below the Bar, paused a moment, looked round the House, and, turning to the right, seated himself in the Liberal camp.

Since the removal from the scene of the commanding figure of Joseph Chamberlain, the front bench of the Unionist party in the Commons has not been so fully endowed with strength and capacity that it could afford to drive out of the camp so promising a recruit. To its subsequent exceeding sorrow it succeeded in doing so.

CHARLES JOSEPH BONAPARTE.

We must show our teeth to Germany, says Mr. Bonaparte, of Baltimore, unless we are willing to be kicked around like Champ Clark's houn'-dawg. This is in line with the advice of Col. Roosevelt. The two men have usually been in accord since the time when Mr. Bonaparte, having pretty well made up his mind that the Republican party was on the road to ruin, singled out the Colonel as the good man in it to whom the people could afford to pin their faith.

The metaphor used, including its illustrative draft upon recent history, has a unique flavor, coming from an ex-Attorney-General of the United States; but then, Charles Joseph Bonaparte has a unique personality. It might be too much to say that he would be recognized at sight as a member of the former

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imperial family of France; yet, in a company of a thousand men, if it were known that a Bonaparte was present, there would be no mistaking any other for him. The general mould of his features, the shape of his head, and the way it is set on his shoulders, would settle that, for the suggestion of the Corsican conqueror is there, beyond a question. What does puzzle one in this man is his speech and manner. The inflections of his voice are so soft, and run such a gamut of gentle undulations, as to be almost wheedling; the fastidiousness of his enunciation is made more effective by an inimitable drawl, and everything he says is sweetly put, even while he is inserting the spit of his sarcasm between the ribs of the victim whom he intends in a moment to roast alive. No matter how severe the treatment he is about to administer, the smile never fades from his lips, and, at the close of every remark which admits of a brief pause after it, one hears issuing from them a faint sound which might be either a suppressed sigh or a guttural chuckle, and which comports quaintly with the bird-like tilt of his head as he utters it.

There is no man in the United States who stands more solidly on his own two feet and asks fewer odds of the world than Mr. Bonaparte. Fond of politics as both a duty and a pastime, and mixing for years with the active movers in political affairs, he courts the favor of no bosses, and lets no one shape his conduct or his opinions against his will. It goes hard, indeed, with the fellow who tries to, for he brooks no trifling with his dignity. His hatred of shams is intense, and he lets everybody know it; still, even his chosen associates sometimes differ with him in judgment as to what is a sham and what is not. Though calling himself a Republican, he insists on maintaining his own standards, and in local campaigns may be found working with one of the other parties when he considers that his party needs a dose of punishment for its soul's good. He never was a candidate himself for any public position except the purely honorary and unsalaried one of Presidential Elector. That was in 1904, and he was the only Republican Elector who pulled through in Maryland—a result which dumfounded some of the critics who had sneered that his refusal to run for office and his general partisan independence were due to his consciousness of weakness in any appeal to the people for their votes.

As a compendium of human contradictions, Mr. Bonaparte is the despair of biographers who are wedded to the conventional in their work. Though by no means indifferent to the distinction of his name, he has steadfastly declined all opportunities which have come his way to remove to France and receive the honors due to one of his blood. He denounced mercilessly the policy of annexation which saddled us with the Philippines; but when the native revolt broke out, and the Anti-Imperialists went to the length of encouraging it, he cut loose and reproved them, declaring that, whatever individual opinions a citizen might proclaim and promote in time of peace, the outbreak of war was his summons to unequivocal support of his Government; and that, the treaty of Paris having become the law of the land, it was as much the duty of the President to crush a rebellion in the annexed provinces as it had been for Lincoln to crush the Southern Confederacy. Albeit President McKinley, during his first term, repeatedly drew upon himself the censure of Bonaparte, the latter supported him for a second term; this, however, did not prevent Bonaparte from standing out against his colleagues on the board of governors of Harvard University when they voted to make McKinley an LL.D., or from publicly asserting that the President was not worthy of the degree.

On one question his worst enemy has never accused Bonaparte of inconsistency: his loyalty to the Catholic communion in which he grew up. In recognition of his fidelity and services to it, he has been decorated with the Lætare medal. Surely, all Bonapartes in this country have reason to feel kindly towards a church that could not be bullied or blandished into abetting the outrage which Napoleon I tried to put upon their first American ancestress.

VIEILLARD.

Literature

PROFESSOR KITTREDGE ON CHAUCER.

Chaucer and His Poetry: Lectures delivered in 1914 on the Percy Turnbull Memorial Foundation in the Johns Hopkins University. By George Lyman Kittredge. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. $1.25 net.

The lectures that make up this volume are six in number. The first is entitled "The Man and His Times"; the remaining lectures deal successively with "The Book of the Duchess," "The House of Fame," "Troilus," and (two) with the "Canterbury Tales." It should be said at once that the treatment of the subject is fresh and readable and that the book complements in a worthy manner the very large output of special monographs, and articles relating to the poet, which for many years past has made the English department at Harvard under Professor Kittredge's direction the most active centre of Chaucer investigation in the world.

It is only in regard to certain matters in the first lecture that we feel disposed to take issue seriously with Professor Kittredge. This lecture contains much that is suggestive—for example, the proposal that we should abandon the tripartite division of Chaucer's literary career and adopt a period of transition between the French and the Italian periods. The new division is really necessary, if we are to comprehend clearly the development of Chaucer's genius. During this period of transition his production was slight, but he was reading enormously in Italian and Latin, in history, philosophy, and romance, and when, emancipated by his wider outlook from the French models of his earlier years, he turns again with renewed energy to composition, he shows himself a new man. On the other hand, an outstanding feature of this first lecture is the endeavor to refute some of the current ideas concerning Chaucer and his age, *e. g.*, that mediæval writers are prone to digress, that Chaucer satirized the Church—above all, that the fourteenth and twentieth centuries are separated by a great disparity of conditions. We do not think that Professor Kittredge has been very successful in these contentions. For example, as regards Chaucer's attitude towards the Church, one may acknowledge the beauty of his portrait of the country parson, but then we have in the same Prologue the inimitable satirical pictures of the monk, the friar, the summoner, and the pardoner. As for the tales themselves, what a modest rôle the priest plays on the journey, as compared with his more worldly fellow-ecclesiastics! After all, when everybody was attacking the Church as it was then constituted—and justly enough—it would have been strange if a clear-headed humorist and man of the world like Chaucer had not joined in. Moreover, to say nothing of his contemporaries, we cannot acquit of a proneness to digression the writer who inserted a summary of the "Æneid" in his description of the temple in the "House of Fame," and who spun out beyond the requirements of humor the learned discourse of the cock in the Nun's Priest's Tale. Does it not also betray a wide difference between our own age and Chaucer's when we find him penning with equal sincerity the Miller's Tale and a translation of Pope Innocent's treatise on the "Wretched Condition of Mankind"? Professor Kittredge has, of course, reflected on these familiar instances before advancing the views which we have cited, but it is hard to understand how, having done so, he should have reached such conclusions. There is something of the same paradoxical spirit in his denial of the quality of naïveté to Chaucer. One may say, perhaps, with some truth, that this was a quality of the age, but, if so, in this, as in other things, the poet was the child of his time. The Prioress's Tale, the Clerk's Tale, the digressions cited above, all illustrate this quality, to say nothing of many a line where the artless addition of a phrase to gain a rhyme or to fill out the requisite number of feet excites a smile in the reader of a more sophisticated generation. Take, for example, such lines as "Swiche as men callen daysyes in our toun." The flowers were so called, of course, in every man's "town," but a rhyme was needed here for "affeccioun" in the next line. Similarly, Troilus bids Pandarus preserve his ashes "In a vessel that men clepeth an urne," and Palamon and Emily are united by the bond "that highte matrimoigne or mariage." We have never felt convinced that the line, "Right as our firste lettre is now an A" ("Troilus," I, 170), which Professor Lowes interprets as implying a compliment to Anne of Bohemia, was not merely another instance of this naïveté of expression.

The lecture on the "Book of the Duchess" constitutes the most elaborate criticism of this poem that we have. Professor Kittredge has shown very well how the elegy is a tissue of conventions borrowed from contemporary French poets, and yet how these conventions have been vitalized. He has aimed especially at bringing into relief its dream character, to which it owes the haunting charm that "eludes analysis, but subdues our mood to a gentle and vaguely troubled

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pensiveness." It is not Chaucer who converses in the forest with the mourning husband, but a dreamer whom his dramatic imagination has created to accord with the sense of the transitoriness of life, love, and happiness which the fate of the mourner awakens.

Just as the "Book of the Duchess" is the love-vision of the French poets adapted to the purposes of personal elegy, so, according to Professor Kittredge, the "House of Fame" is an adaptation of the same conception to a "wonder-journey of intense ironical significance." He rightly rejects ten Brink's effort to read an allegory of Chaucer's own life into the First Book. "The temple and the desert are simply devices to transport the poet into the fantastic regions of dreamland where the eagle can swoop down on him conveniently." The author's discussion of the "House of Fame" appears to us thoroughly sound, and the same thing is true of his lecture on "Troilus." We note here particularly the pages on the relation of the love-story to the mediæval code of courtly love and the analysis of the characters of Troilus, Pandarus, and Cressida. The last-named he takes to be neither a victim nor a scheming adventuress. She is not insincere in her love for Troilus, and she does not encourage him out of any selfish regard to her personal interests. When she seems to be turning her mind to such considerations, "she is merely seeking to justify to her reason the interest she is beginning to feel in her gallant lover." She is the same to the end as at the beginning, "amorous, gentle, affectionate, and charming altogether, but fatally impressionable and yielding. Her strength of will is no match for her inconstant heart."

The two concluding lectures on the "Canterbury Tales" call for less comment. Only the dramatic quality of the Tales, which is striking enough, to be sure, is overemphasized. "From this point of view (*i. e.*, of structure), which surely accords with Chaucer's intention," says Professor Kittredge, "the Pilgrims do not exist for the sake of the stories, but vice versa." A mere comparison of the number of lines given to the tales and the connecting links, respectively, shows, however, that the "Canterbury Tales" is primarily a collection of stories. Moreover, the stories do not in every instance fit inevitably with the characters to whom they are assigned. So with the Merchant's Tale, for which nothing in the description of this character in the Prologue prepares us. And, *pace* Professor Kittredge, the same thing obviously holds good of the rollicking envoy of the Clerk's Tale, if, as he assumes, this outrageous piece of anti-feminist fun is to be regarded as the utterance of the Clerk. As a matter of fact, it is headed "Lenvoy de Chaucer." The lectures on Chaucer's masterpiece, however, like the rest of the book, are written with lively sympathy and, as it is hardly necessary to add, with a full grasp of the material, and they make agreeable reading, both for the scholar and the general reader.

CURRENT FICTION.

A Bride of the Plains. By Baroness Orczy. New York: George H. Doran Co.

It is no disparagement of Baroness Orczy's tales of romance and adventure like "The Scarlet Pimpernel" and "The Laughing Cavalier" to say that we welcome cordially her departure in manner in the present volume. Indeed, almost an ideal way for the gifted author to spend the rest of her career would be in writing alternately these two styles of fiction. "A Bride of the Plains" has a timeliness—can we help judging everything now by the norm of slaughter?—which is emphasized in the touching dedication to Louis Kossuth: "What would you have said now—O patriot and selfless hero—had you lived to see the country which you loved so well . . . tied to Austria's chariot wheel, the cat's-paw and the tool of that Teutonic race which you abhorred?" The Baroness but voices the sentiment universally felt by those of her adopted country towards one—and that one perhaps the bravest—of the peoples with whom they are at war. Save for the preface, there is nothing of war in Baroness Orczy's new novel, although the first chapter opens with a vivid picture of the departure of the lads of a Hungarian village for their three years of military service. For the rest, while by no means devoid of interest in incident and plot, the book is principally valuable for its detailed and sympathetic description of life in a Hungarian village, among some of the simplest, merriest, and most charming people of Europe. Even those whose sympathies are most strongly on the side of the Allies in the war, if they read this book, cannot but find some consolation for the enforced retirement of the Russians from their positions in the Carpathians in the thought that these smiling plains of which Baroness Orczy gives so picturesque a description, have been spared, for a time at least, the desolation which follows in the wake of marching armies.

The Red Geranium. By William Carleton. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co.

Romance in workingmen's budgets and pictorial possibilities in agricultural bulletins—these are Mr. Carleton's own peculiar discoveries. We do not know of any one more likely to promote an active belief in scientific farming among rural readers, nor any one who more temptingly sets forth the substantial advantages which modern farm life has to offer the city dweller, nor of any public service better worth rendering than these. Certainly, American audiences for whom making a living is ever the dominant theme are little likely to find fault with him as a story-teller. His imagination frankly balks when it is a question of the terrors besetting a resourceless mother of three in the city without a heart, but once past this uncongenial situation there is no gainsaying his persuasive pen, as he has shrewdly hastened to disavow all the more widely suspected fallacies as to fortunes in poultry and other too, too hopeful illusions of the amateur countryman. He can figure out a heroine's livelihood in red geraniums, and a fair margin of profit for a hero who supplies tenement babies with certified milk below market prices—and that with a reasonableness in which there is a touch of positive genius. His calculations, at once inspiriting and plausible, will afford the disinterested a thrill of satisfaction akin to that which Stevenson professed to derive from the inventory of Crusoe's salvage.

The Seven Darlings. By Gouverneur Morris. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The author of this comedy has made sure his place as an interpreter for those who chew gum of what they call the Four Hundred. That the sextet of heroines here provided have the souls of gum-chewers beneath the surface of their amazing beauty and social security will doubtless give them the last supreme endearment for their predestined clientèle. Mr. Morris has done all that is necessary in the direction of making them otherwise human, and Mr. H. C. Christy, who, with Mr. C. D. Gibson, has also settled down to the manufacture of chewing-gum, charmingly decorates the package with his well-known "types." The thing is all about a brother and six sisters who are left with nothing but an expensive "camp" in the Adirondacks, turn it into an inn, and promptly pair off with the first guests who arrive. That is putting it baldly, of course. There are various episodes sufficiently "piquant" to arrest momentarily and thrillingly the busiest youthful jaw.

Waiting. By Gerald O'Donovan. New York: Mitchell Kennerley.

The theme of this story has now become almost hackneyed, and the present writer has failed to give it special freshness of interpretation. Like Mr. O'Donovan's "Father Ralph," this is an uncompromising picture of a priest-ridden Ireland. As before, a sharp distinction is drawn between the few and for the most part powerless priests of spiritual and intellectual force, and the ruck of ignorant and self-seeking oppressors of the people. Father Ralph's solution was to leave the church and to leave Ireland. The Maurice of the present tale is not a priest, but a schoolmaster with the makings of a statesman. His independence early makes an enemy of Father Mahon, the priestly bully of the tale, who has officially the whip-hand as "manager" of Maurice's school. This school is by law secular and undenominational, but is really under the control of the church, and when Maurice outrages Father Mahon by asking for a dispensation to marry a Protestant (a dispensation which he is in no position to buy), he is dismissed from his post. Maurice marries his Protestant at a registry office, and becomes a not unsuccessful journalist. When, however, he follows his inclination and capacity into active politics, a churchly issue is made against him on the grounds of his marriage, all the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authority of the priesthood is marshalled to defeat him, and he is easily beaten at the polls by a rich and scoundrelly publican. Mahon's culminating act is a refusal of absolution to Maurice's old and dying friend, because he has supported Maurice in his marriage, and now harbors his wife and child under his roof. "You'll get no sacrament, no absolution, no communion, no anointing from me, a priest of God, till you repent of your sin, and make reparation to me and God by turning out these people from under your roof." But old Driscoll will not buy salvation at that rate: "God won't ask me to do what I haven't the heart to do myself—His own Mother, they say, was once turned out in the snow, and He within her." In his spirit Maurice determines to stand by Ireland, in the hope of a better day: "Truth and freedom must come of faith and love—we'll stay here, working, enduring, waiting." Which interprets, at last, the title of the story.

AN ESSAY ON ESSAYISTS.

The English Essay and Essayists. By Hugh Walker. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.50 net.

Like most of its predecessors in the series, The Channels of English Literature, this work is thoroughly readable. As a piece of literary history, however, it still leaves something to be desired. We had no extended systematic account of the essay, and Professor Walker has not altogether supplied the deficiency. For the general reader, he has provided an agreeable introduction. For the student, he has rather revived pleasant impressions than pointed out fresh prospects. He raises the really difficult question of defining his subject, but he dismisses it unanswered. Though he hints at a distinction between "essays of the centre," like Lamb's, and essays of the periphery, like Fuller's, he admits or excludes almost any piece of expository prose without reference to any clearly stated or maintained principle.

Let us illustrate his somewhat casual procedure. He has a chapter on the "character-writers"; and, of course, he admits the imaginary portraits of the De Coverley papers; but he has not a word on the imaginary portraits of Pater, whom, with a brief condemnation of his philosophy, he relegates to the domain of literary criticism. He admits the "Biographical Studies" of Bagehot; but he does not mention Walton's "Lives." He touches on White of Selborne and gives a page and a half to the hectic revery and word-painting of Richard Jefferies; but he says nothing of Walton's "Complete Angler," which is for the most part in the perfect vein of the essay-according-to-Montaigne. He discusses the letters of Junius and the pamphlets of Paine; but he ignores the indubitable essays of Jeremy Collier, Shenstone, and Edward Young. He includes Fuller's "Holy State," Browne's "Religio Medici," and Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection"; but he leaves quite unnoticed the "Meditations and Contemplations" of Hervey and Traherne's "Centuries of Meditation." He yields, though grudgingly, a place to Ruskin's lectures on art; but passes in silence the admirable "Discourses" of Sir Joshua Reynolds. He declares that lecturing and laying down the law are "utterly foreign to the spirit of the essay"; yet in the previous chapter on the "historian-essayists" he has treated such lecturers and absolute law-givers as Carlyle, Macaulay, Froude, and Freeman. In the end, one is rather more than less in the dark than before as to the nature of the genus "essay" and its "species."

Professor Walker is apparently satisfied with the time-honored notion that Bacon was the father and Montaigne the grandfather of English essayists—which is as much as to say that he is comparatively incurious about literary origins, relationships, and influences. The true relationship between these two worthies, who are from nearly every point of view so conspicuously dissimilar, awaits the elucidation of an investigator who will compare them both not only with their contemporaries, but also with the "essayists" of classical antiquity—Plutarch, Tacitus, Seneca, Cicero, Plato, and Aristotle—to whom they are both so deeply indebted, and to whom many of their successors made independent returns. An extended discussion of the essay in England might reasonably be expected to make some acknowledgment that the essay was not "invented" in England nor in France. It might be expected to call attention to a certain analogy between the Epicurean self-examination of Montaigne and the religious self-examination of monastic writers, and to trace to mediæval and other sources the mystic elation of religious essayists of the seventeenth century. It might be expected to show how fresh foreign models, such as La Bruyère, as well as social forces and periodical publication, operated in the eighteenth century to give to the essay a social, objective, and satirical character. It might be expected in discussing such a writer as Hazlitt to bring out not merely his flashing intelligence, but also his romantic sensibility; to relate him not merely to the Restoration wits, whom he loved, but also to Rousseau, whom he adored. To write an account of the English essay without mentioning the author of the "Confessions" and the "Rêveries"—and Professor Walker does not mention him—is to ignore its second Montaigne; is to be just a bit "insular."

The virtue of the book is in its wholesome æsthetic treatment of individual authors, rather than in any notable additions to literary cartography. It presents fairly adequate appreciations of many admired writers from Bacon to John Synge. It says in general just about what one should expect it to say; but its prevailing orthodoxy is occasionally relieved by an attempt to touch up a neglected reputation or to make a new point for an established celebrity. There is a well-merited flash of enthusiasm for the mellifluous gravity of Drummond's "Cypress Grove"; an approving nod for Clarendon; an interesting exaltation of Goldsmith at Addison's expense, with a special plea for the recognition of the "inspired idiot's" philosophical and political wisdom; a strong accent upon the "wisdom" of Lamb, which few will resent; a good word for the obsolescent Alexander Smith; a place for Gissing just below Stevenson; and friendly salutes for the recently departed shades of Leslie Stephen, Richard Middleton, Andrew Lang, and Francis Thompson. An honest, substantial volume; one is among old acquaintances; their quips and aphorisms bear repetition; and one is soon enough at the last page—in excellent humor. As an extended essay on the essayists, one is ready to give it a cordial welcome.

A FORECAST OF THE WAR.

The Anglo-German Problem. By Charles Sarolea. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1 net.

"Europe is drifting slowly but steadily towards an awful catastrophe which, if it does happen, will throw back civilization for the coming generation, as the war of 1870 threw back civilization for the generation which followed and which inherited its dire legacy of evil." This is the opening sentence of a most interesting book, published in 1912, the fulfilment of whose prophetic insight we are witnessing to-day. So remarkably, in fact, have the author's predictions been fulfilled, and so well have his assertions been justified by events, that one can easily pardon the rather complacent "Foreword" to the edition of 1915, much of which is an elaboration upon the theme, "I told you so!"

Mr. Sarolea is "a Fleming by birth and a Dutchman by origin," who has spent years in close study of German history, literature, and ideals, and who in 1912 felt moved to write out the conclusions to which his studies had forced him concerning the relations between England and Germany, conceiving that a recognition of the truth by both countries was the only thing that could avert an armed conflict. His work covers a wide field, but its leading theses may be reduced to two: first, that Germany's grievances against England are, for the most part, imaginary; and, secondly, that the causes of conflict between the two nations are by no means imaginary, but are to be found in essentially incompatible ideals. In the preface of 1912 he writes:

> The present conflict between England and Germany is the old conflict between liberalism and militarism, between progress and reaction, between the masses and the classes. The conflict between England and Germany is a conflict, on the one hand, between a nation which believes in political liberty and national autonomy, where the press is free, and where the rulers are responsible to public opinion, and, on the other hand, a nation where public opinion is still muzzled or powerless, and where the masses are still under the heel of an absolute government, a reactionary party, a military Junkertum, and a despotic bureaucracy.

Assertions of this latter sort about Germany

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are, of course, common enough to-day, and, in fact, they were common even in 1912; but nowhere else, so far as the reviewer is aware, is there to be found so logical and convincing and unprejudiced a massing of facts in support of the assertion. With fine mastery over his material and a keen insight into the nature of the issue, the author analyzes such matters as the almost universal distrust of Germany in 1912; the contrast between Prussia and Southern Germany, and the mastery of the former over the latter; the tendencies towards reaction in Germany; its sham democracy; the Prussian idealization of the state; the stupid oppression meted out by the Government to its Polish subjects; the unsteady policy of the Kaiser, whose influence, in spite of his real desire for peace, has tended almost entirely towards militarism and the war spirit; and the futility of German Socialism, which, with all its talk of peace and progress, is really the mainstay of reaction and militarism, since the Government constantly uses it as a bugbear to frighten the Liberals into the arms of the Junkers.

Mr. Sarolea brings equal ability and learning to the analysis of the German grievances against Great Britain. These are chiefly two: namely, that England has prevented the expansion of German commerce and colonization, keeping her from a place in the sun; and that, under the guidance of Edward VII, that arch-plotter, she has stirred up Europe against Germany, encircled and isolated her, and "that in the Concert of Europe she has wrested the conductor's bâton from the hands of the Kaiser." The first of these grievances is disposed of rather easily by showing that Great Britain, with her free trade and her many colonies, has been Germany's best customer and best friend, and that Germany's lack of colonies is due, first, to her late arrival in the game of colonial expansion; secondly, to Bismarck's throwing away of what opportunities she had; and, *thirdly, to the fact that Germans lack* the qualities of adventure and the training in self-government that make successful colonists. For the second grievance there seems at first to be some ground. Certainly, if we compare the position of Germany at the Berlin Conference in 1878 and her position at Algeciras in 1905, her loss of prestige is sufficiently striking. But to lay all this to Edward VII is, in the author's opinion, a very amateurish way of reading history. In Germany's own conduct is to be found a quite sufficient reason for the falling off of each of her old supporters. The cordial friendship of England she certainly might have retained had she not, by brooding over imaginary grievances, and by enthusiasm for England's enemies, nursed among her people a jealousy of British colonial expansion and an unreasoned dislike for their island neighbor; and by the upbuilding of her fleet, the talk of her Kaiser, and the direction of her policies forced England to search for other allies.

As this review will indicate, Mr. Sarolea's book is frankly partisan in its critique of Germany and its defence of England. But this does not mean necessarily that its author is prejudiced. Certainly he has had every opportunity to form an impartial judgment. And, however one may feel about his conclusions, the facts which he presents and his method of handling them are such that few will read his book without gaining new insight into the great political problem of the day.

THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS.

Modern Russia. By Gregor Alexinsky. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.50 net.

The author was a Deputy in the short-lived Second Duma, a member of the so-called Majority Social-Democratic faction, one of its leaders and its best speaker. He was elected to the Duma from the workingman curia of Petrograd, and had been in charge of lectures in courses organized for workingmen. He had also engaged in the work of local provincial councils, had been one of the so-called "third element," which, of all classes, has come into actual, close contact with the peasantry. He is therefore able to give us an interesting point of view on many aspects of Russian history and politics; and, as he explains, he is giving in this book a "small encyclopædia of Russian life." It is important, as well as interesting, that the views of the Russian Social-Democrat should become more widely known to the English-reading public.

The writer takes the usual attitude of the urban Socialist towards the peasant; for him the peasant is a potential, if not an actual, bourgeois—a word which appears, in italics, throughout the text. The writer speaks of the "romantic hopes" of that branch of Russian Socialists who devoted their attention to the peasantry. Similarly, he tells us that "the Russian novel of the nineteenth century, with such masters as *Gontcharov, Turgenieff, and Tolstoy*, was largely the fruit of 'aristo-serf' culture." Tolstoy was educated in a pre-capitalist environment, which left its mark on him. The writer quotes at length from the work of a young scholar, Pavlov-Silvansky, a Social-Democrat, who writes particularly on the question of feudalism in Russia; but, as the author states, the views of this scholar represent the opinion of a minority among Russian historians.

At many points we find the orthodox economic interpretation of Russian history. In speaking of the reforms of the law courts of 1864 the author says: "The new justice was evoked by new economic necessity; the development of the capitalistic production and exchange calls for the protection of the person and material property of every Russian, a protection which the old judicial system could no longer extend." He accepts the usual and much-exploited idea of an inevitable antagonism between Russia and England in their respective imperialisms; he sees no basis for common economic interests between the two countries. Treating of the subject of other than economic antagonisms, he declares: "We have a right to assert that the revolutionary movement of the popular masses, the working class, the peasants, and the army and the navy is the best and principal guarantee of a pacific attitude on the part of the Russian monarchy." Recent facts tend to invalidate his conclusions made a year ago.

It is always the Russian Social-Democrat that we recognize clearly in the author's interpretations of Russian politics and life. The present Duma is even less than useless. The Second Duma failed because the Liberals were too cowardly. It will be recalled that the Second Duma was dissolved because the Social-Democratic members had interpreted their mandate from the people as obliging them to keep in touch with soldiers as well. They had received petitions from soldiers in active service, "in which the soldiers expressed the cause of their discontent." The writer is, however, always careful to state that he represents only one section of the Russian public, for by no means all the Russian "intellectuals" are Socialists: "The disciples of Socialism form the most democratic sphere of the intellectual classes, and the highest sphere (professors, advocates, engineers, etc.) is in sympathy with the *bourgeois* Liberals and Radicals."

It is important that we should learn the views and programmes of all political parties in Russia, and Mr. Alexinsky is well qualified, particularly by reason of his broad, practical experience in public life, to give those of the Russian Social-Democrat.

CITIZENS FROM SCANDINAVIA.

The Scandinavian Element in the United States. By Kendric Charles Babcock. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Social Studies, Vol. III, No. 3. $1.15.

This careful study of the immigration from Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, in its relations to the progress of the West, is presented as a part of the story which has supplanted the views of the New England school of historians, but it has not altogether renounced their methods. It offers a detailed account of whatever religious motives have influenced the course of Scandinavian immigration—though the author finds that the most notable experiment in this kind, the Swedish settlement in Illinois in 1846, was founded on economic or philanthropic rather than religious motives. The failure of this communistic society did not indicate that Scandinavians were unfit for industrial coöperation; and a discussion of the indebtedness of the Middle West to later immigrants for the development of co-operative dairying would have added to the value of this work. It is shown that the stream of immigration from the Scandinavian countries was largely directed to Minnesota and the adjacent States by an organized appeal to the economic motive by State governments and railway companies; and the agricultural progress due to this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement is graphically described. But it is not pointed out that these immigrants, the Norwegians especially, are almost as apt to be seamen or fishermen as farmers. The notable advance of the Scandinavian element on the Pacific Coast, where it constitutes more than a fourth of the foreign population of cities like Seattle and Tacoma, is largely due to opportunity for maritime pursuits. The Scandinavians are more capable of founding homes without giving up going to sea than other mariners.

As might have been expected from Dr. Babcock's previous works, the question of education is competently handled. While the Scandinavians are credited with loyalty to the public school system, it appears that there has been some misdirected effort in keeping up parochial schools and in multiplying poorly equipped seminaries and colleges to which it is difficult to attract pupils. The Grundtvigian "high schools" are mentioned as keeping alive the traditions of Denmark; but we are not told whether they have done anything in America to promote the organization of rural communities in the Danish fashion. The redemption of agriculture in Denmark during the last generation has been associated with the educational ideas of Bishop Grundtvig—who surely deserves a place in the index of this volume. The campaign in Wisconsin in 1889 against compulsory education in English is narrated, though the results are rather vaguely stated, and the Minnesota statute of 1883, which provided for a "professorship of the Scandinavian language and literature in the State University" is denounced for the looseness of its terms. Had the nouns been plural, the clause might pass without censure.

The considerable political activity of the Scandinavian immigrants is discussed with candor and moderation. It is curious to find them voting steadily against saloons and the liquor traffic, in view of the European standard in such matters; but it may be that the occasional indulgence in raw alcohol, which has been noted in the case of many of the Swedes, has caused mischief enough, especially in promoting insanity, to account for the feeling in favor of restriction. On the whole, Dr. Babcock is fortunate in dealing with a body of immigrants whose moral and political progress towards complete Americanization presents so few problems. The history of previous assimilation in Great Britain is of favorable augury, which is borne out by the records of some millions of our fellow-citizens of Scandinavian stock. Though the services of such men in the armies of the Civil War are acknowledged, something might be said of the value of the same element in the navy, where scores of Scandinavian seamen have become warrant officers.

The author sees danger in the demands for "recognition" in the distribution of offices on the part of "Swedish-Americans or other hyphenated Americans"—he was writing before last September; but he sums up by assigning "a mighty, silent, steadying influence" for peace and righteousness to the Scandinavian immigrants. The book closes with a valuable critical essay on materials and authorities and a series of tables derived from the reports of the census. The index is rather scanty, though it offers topics as well as proper names.

Notes

The Macmillan Co. announces the forthcoming publication of "The Pentecost of Calamity," by Owen Wister.

"Marie Tarnowska," by Anne Vivanti Chartres, and "Habits that Handicap," by Charles B. Towns, will be published shortly by the Century Co.

The following volumes are announced for publication on August 28 by Henry Holt & Co.: "American Diplomacy," by Carl Russell Fish; "Some Musicians of Former Days," by Romain Rolland; "Jane Clegg," by St. John Ervine.

The Writers' Publishing Co. announces the forthcoming publication of "Dennis Hathnaught," by James Philip MacCarthy, and "The Serio-Comic Profession," by L. J. de Bekker.

The announcement a year ago that a civil government was to be established in the Canal Zone naturally gave the impression that some other form of government had existed previously, and the further step of naming an army officer as Governor seemed to mean military instead of civil rule. It was the purpose of George W. Goethals, Governor of the Canal Zone, in the Stafford Little lectures at Princeton this year, to remove this impression by showing that essentially the Government of the Canal Zone is now what it has been since April 1, 1905—"a Government by executive order." The only real difference is that the system formerly prevailing rested upon the Executive orders of President Roosevelt, the last one of which, vesting all authority in the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission, "while not in exact accord with the law, secured the end desired," while "the new conditions are founded on law." Gov. Goethals's lectures, now put in book form ("Government of the Canal Zone"; Princeton University Press; $1 net), trace the administration of the territory from the treaty with the new republic of Panama in 1903 to date.

The first two volumes of "A History of England and the British Empire," by Arthur D. Innes, as noted in an earlier number of the *Nation* (March 26, 1914), reached to the year 1689. The third and fourth volumes, now before us (Macmillan; $1.60 each), extend respectively to 1802 and to the outbreak of the present war. As the British Empire expanded enormously during these two centuries and a quarter, the author's task of giving adequate attention to the growth of its component parts and yet of avoiding a mere patchwork of disjointed details, became more difficult. But he has met his task with good skill and success. The material is blocked out clearly and simply. Paragraph headings, maps, and a good index in each volume will be welcomed by students. As in the earlier volumes, the author sums up effectively at intervals the most significant constitutional, economic, and literary movements of a period. He is never tempted into fine writing, nor does he have a distinct style, as did Green and Froude and Macaulay; but his short, vigorous sentences are clear and well suited to his purpose. His history ought to find favor with those who want a consistent and up-to-date account of the growth of the British Empire, which will be fuller than the school textbooks and less heavy than the many-volumed coöperative histories of England.

Among pro-German advocates, Prof. Kuno Francke has the exceptional merit of dignity and moderation—based naturally on respect for the opinion he is fain to attack. These qualities are prominent in the little book, "A German-American's Confession of Faith" (B. W. Huebsch; 50 cents net). We have a selection of the author's letters to the press, and magazine articles of recent months. With the origins of the war he does not deal explicitly, though he plainly shares the notion of *Einkreisung*. He dwells rather upon the positive political merits of the German system, upon the ability and representative character of the Kaiser, upon the intense patriotism of the race. When, however, he represents Germany as struggling for the freedom of the seas, and deserving of international support in the endeavor, his sense of humor, to say the least, is at fault. In a century the most serious impairment of the freedom of the seas has been the submarine warfare. Professor Francke, in seeing straight the issue of exporting arms and the duty of German-Americans at this crisis, has shown admirable poise and great courage. Declining to associate himself with separatist movements, he admits that to permit the traffic in munitions, however morally reprehensible, has become a part of our duty as a neutral. We have no right to change conditions during hostilities in a manner favorable or unfavorable to any of the combatants. Professor Francke's cool sense in this disputed case contrasts very favorably with the sophistical distinctions recently advanced by the expert in international law, Professor Burgess. Poems, in German, scattered through Professor Francke's text attest the depth of his German feeling. We wish his book a wide reading, both here and abroad. He is the spokesman of that silent majority of German-Americans who, with their new loyalty to America intact, still sympathize with the Fatherland in its ordeal. It is well their voice should be heard. They have been sorely misrepresented by self-appointed agitators. Professor Francke's loyal, calm, yet deeply felt utterances do much to restore the true balance of things.

Those who have puzzled themselves over the rather confusing data presented in the "Compendium of Philosophy," translated a few years ago by Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, will welcome the concise yet clear exposition of Buddhist Psychology given by the same competent scholar in the little manual of the Quest Series, entitled "Buddhist Psychology. An Inquiry into the Analysis and Theory of Mind in Pali Literature" (Macmillan; $1 net). In it an attempt is made not only to elucidate the psychology of the Buddhists, but also to determine its historical growth, as revealed in turn by the Nikāya and Abhidhamma. Whether Buddhistic psychology will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever be regarded as adding anything to our real knowledge cannot fairly be determined till we are in possession of all the literature on the subject. Possibly the works of Buddhadatta, which Mrs. Rhys Davids assures us will soon be accessible to English readers, may instruct as well as interest historically the western investigator; but it is more probable that the value of all these works will remain what it is now, and consist not in fresh discoveries, but in the demonstration that there is a certain similarity between views attained long ago in the East, and those advanced by modern European scholars. Yet from the scientific point of view, Buddhist psychology repels at the outset, since we find ourselves nonplussed by the analysis of mind on which the whole system is based. As the author herself vividly expresses it, "Our logic kicks against" a coördination of consciousness and phases of consciousness as being ultimates. Nor can we learn anything psychologically from an analysis of consciousness as moral and immoral. Yet whether we learn anything or not we cannot but be attracted by the struggles of the Buddhists to express for the first time the relation among mental factors. Thus the recognition of "neutral feeling," which "is comparable with ignorance," is perhaps illogical, but the confusion of feeling and knowledge is a phenomenon worth noting. To the Occidental, however, there remains a hopeless confusion in the fundamental distinction between *saññā*, defined as conscious state, sense-perception, and recognition, and *viññāna*, defined as a consciousness of tastes, each being an "awareness" of difference in sensations, yet making a distinct "aggregate," the latter term also representing "any awareness of mind." Mrs. Rhys-Davids is hopeful that some day we shall find a wise man of the East who will explain the logical anomaly and "do justice to the subject." More important is the treatment of Ideation, with its explanation of the Jhānas, or states of ecstatic musing, induced by auto-suggestion; in which the subject remains master of himself, not so much "possessed," as ecstatically self-possessed and able to enter into or emerge from the trance deliberately. The final chapters of this excellent book take up the "Questions of Milinda" and mediæval developments, the substitution of four for the five "aggregates" by Buddhadatta, etc. It is the clearest exposition of the project we know.

"America and Her Problems," by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant (Macmillan; $2 net), is based on recollections of various lecture trips which the author made in the interest of peace and of amity between France and America. The tour covered the country broadly, and brought the acquaintance of many academic audiences, and of our more progressive spirits generally. From such an inception, the book assumes a curious literary form. It is an interweaving of travel sketches with what are virtually short editorials on manifold issues of American policy. This journalistic impression is enhanced by running headlines, sometimes two or three to a page. It cannot be said that the literary results are engaging. The latter part of the book deals in more extended discussion and is more valuable. We have not seen a better or more impressive statement of the moral *impasse* reached in the negro question. What is said about inland waterways is timely and excellent. Entirely sympathetic and just is all the comment on our educational system, though the author is too amiable to express the real danger of intellectual plebification. What is written about German policy, evoked by Milwaukee, reads like prophecy. It was written a year or so before the war. The author was in California during the suffrage campaign, and became a willing convert to the cause. With entire consistency he is the enthusiastic champion of co-education. Very interesting is the hint of our universities as centres of antimonarchical revolution, and perhaps justified by the results in China. In a passage which rises to real eloquence, he describes the appeasing and disciplinary effect upon the workman of the new machine tools. Yet it was the housesmiths' union which made a specialty of dynamiting. There is much that is weighty and interesting in the book, but it is evident that the author dealt too exclusively with a certain type of idealist, and not unnaturally got, in the main, courteous echoes of his own pacificist views. His earnest protest against the fortifying of the Panama Canal will find many dissenters. The idea that the Suez Canal is secured by an intangible world consensus will to common-sense readers seem fairly mystical. It too plainly is secured by the British fleet. It will seem to many a doubtful service to assure Americans that the two oceans are her all sufficient guard against invasion, especially when this dictum is accompanied by a protest against our very moderate naval programme. Nor is it in accordance with our previous military experience to laud our militia as an adequate first line of defence. Again the fear that Washington is becoming imperialistic, and hence un-American, seems at least exaggerated. These appear to us the more contestible positions in a generally just and stimulating book. Such lapses are perhaps the inevitable penalty of an idealism so generous as is the author's.

A book on "The Salon and English Letters" was yet to be added to the innumerable volumes, most of them poor things, indeed, that have been made recently out of the gossip of the eighteenth century; and such a book (Macmillan; $2.25 net) has been put together by Prof. C. B. Tinker—with laudable success. The material has been well sifted, and the results have been presented with the needed lightness of touch, yet with no affectation of wit. The style has the right professional ring. Professor Tinker, for the origin of the Salon, goes back to the Italian courts of the Renaissance, of which the ideal model is portrayed in Castiglione's "Cortegiano," and from its origin and its history deduces the characteristics of the institution in Paris and London. Of the tone of the conversation he has this to say:

> It would be a simple explanation of all this respect for the Salon and its discussions to observe that England was now enjoying an age of free speech. It is even simpler to point out that there was much discussion because there was much to discuss. There were problems confronting the public which were no less important than novel. This is all true, but somewhat lacking in subtlety. The peculiar adaptability of these problems to conversation was due to the fact that they were, in general, still problems of a remote and idealistic kind. They did not yet demand instant solution, for better or for worse. Exception must, of course, be made of questions purely political, but the rest of them—the theory of equality and the republican form of government, the development of machinery, the education of the masses, humanitarianism, the problem of the dormant, self-satisfied Church, romanticism, and the whole swarm of theories popularized by Rousseau—had been stated and widely discussed, but they had not yet shaken society to its foundations. They were still largely theoretical. Men's thoughts were engaged, and their tongues were busy, but their hearts were not yet failing them for fear.

The writer of that paragraph knows the eighteenth century. And he knows its men and women. The names that first come to one's mind when the English salon is mentioned are probably Walpole, Mrs. Montagu, and Dr. Johnson, and in all three cases Professor Tinker has said the right thing. He knows how to praise Johnson; he can estimate the degree of seriousness in Walpole's mind, and can like the man while not forgetting his foibles; and he has the grace to laugh philanthropically at the prodigious Mrs. Montagu, while still seeing what she accomplished for English letters. Those are three difficult things to do, and, being done, they make a good book.

The sundial was a picturesque and sufficiently accurate method of measuring the hours, from the time when Isaiah declared that he would cause the shadow of the dial of Ahaz to move backward ten steps, down to the introduction of watches and clocks in the eighteenth century. Its simplest form was the "noon-mark" of old New England houses—a line cut across the window-sill to mark the shadow on the frame at twelve o'clock. The sundial at the present time is principally used as an ornament to "old" gardens, unconsulted, save as a curiosity, or by romantic persons like Dolly and Mr. Carter, of the well-known "Dialogues." The latter, it will be remembered, translated the motto "Horas non numero nisi serenas—" as "A woman counts all hours lost which she does not spend in the society of her husband." To make more than six hundred apposite rhymed mottoes for the dial, each with its temporal or mortal sting, would seem to be no mean task; yet it has been done by Geoffroy W. Henslow in "Ye Sundial Booke" (Longmans; $3.50 net). Here are about four hundred pen and ink illustrations of the sundials of many places and periods, each with a motto by the author. There is an overflow of a dozen pages of additional verses, generally rhymed couplets, at the end of this well-made volume. One specimen taken at random will give a taste of the quality of this ambitious Father Tabb of the sundial.

> Injure not this dial,
> Damage not your friend,
> But let me teach awhile
> Life's hours to better spend.

Needless to say, the illustrations are better made than the verses.

A more comprehensive and convenient history of our State constitutions than that given in the scattered chapters devoted to the subject in Francis N. Thorpe's "Constitutional History of the American People" has been long needed. It is furnished in a tripartite work by James Q. Dealey, entitled "The Growth of American State Constitutions" (Ginn: $1.40 net), and carrying the subject from 1776 to the present year. The first two divisions are mere labors of analysis and synthesis, one treating the development of the constitutions of the various States through conventions and amendments, the other examining contemporary instruments to determine their provisions with regard to the sev-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eral departments, the regulation of important interests by commission, the suffrage, and so on. No attempt is made to depict the background for the various constitutional movements, as, for example, the growth of the upland farm districts which early led in the seaboard States of the South to the enlargement of the suffrage, or the agrarian discontent and other causes leading to the present radicalism in many Western States. The least formal of the three divisions, therefore, is the last, which offers certain constructive suggestions as to the probable trend of constitutional change in the next few years. These are conservative enough, for it requires no special prescience to foretell that we are certain to see a greater concentration of power in the State Executive, that the reorganization of our Legislatures will decrease the use of the initiative and referendum, and that the States are bound to follow the cities in the employment of experts and in insistence upon civil-service rules. The volume should be equally useful as a reference book and a text.

A thoughtful attempt to estimate the mission and character of Jesus, popular in form and intended to quicken the courage and faith of the Christian reader, has recently been made by Prof. F. L. Anderson in his "Man of Nazareth" (Macmillan; $1 net). The main source employed is the Synoptic tradition; it is not, however, rigidly adhered to, as is evident both from repeated references to the Fourth Gospel and from the remark that the kingdom of God, "looked at from the divine side, is a new birth" (p. 121). Indeed, the attentive reader may properly inquire whether, without the Johannine conception of life, the conclusion could have been reached that "the kingdom of God is first of all a spiritual kingdom within men" (p. 123). The fact that the book is "not an investigation but a statement of results" and that it purposely omits a detailed treatment of the evidence on which the conclusions are based explains much to which otherwise exception might be taken. It explains, for example, the inadequate discussion of such crucial passages as Mark x, 45, and xiv, 24; it explains the failure to mention that the summing up of the Torah in love to God and love to neighbor which is one of "the elements of originality" in Jesus and is "the profoundest and most valuable contribution to ethics ever made," is assigned by Luke to a Scribe of that very Pharisaism which "so filled the whole horizon with the thought of the law, that the idea of God and immediate relation to Him was shoved (*sic*) into the background" (p. 102); and it explains the sketch of the character of Jesus in which there are singled out for mention certainty, courage, joy, love, wisdom, power, and goodness, attributes apposite in a large measure to a prophet like Jeremiah. It is to be hoped that the author will take seriously his readiness "to defend his position in the scholarly arena"; for his openmindedness, his willingness to observe what he calls "the rules of the critical game," and his obviously wide acquaintance with the relevant literature encourage us to expect from him a solid contribution to learning.

Although the rigorous censorship of the present European war has left little opportunity for the war correspondent, the adventurous experiences of correspondents in former wars are not likely soon to lose their fascination for readers young and old. To readers who have not time for the extended biographies and other works of these earlier military reporters, F. Lauriston Bullard's "Famous War Correspondents" (Little, Brown; $2 net) may be commended. In addition to accounts of a dozen famous correspondents, from Sir W. H. Russell and Archibald Forbes to Winston Spencer Churchill and James Creelman, Mr. Bullard gives us comprehensive sketches of reporters and their work during the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, and a well worked out chapter on the rise of the war correspondent and his problematical future. The style is extremely readable, and the whole book well worth attention.

Bernier's "Travels in the Mogul Empire" has been reprinted and translated too often to need reviewing, but all scholars will welcome the new version of Constable's (1891) "Travels" as revised by the indefatigable historian of India, Vincent A. Smith (Oxford University Press; 6s. net). The references to Catrou in Constable have here been converted into references to the original "Storia do Mogor" of Manucci, recently made accessible, emendations of earlier slips and actual errors (as, for example, the origin of Hanscrit for Sanscrit) have been introduced wherever necessary (silently or through a special note), and the whole work has been thoroughly gone over by a master hand and published in one handy little volume. A book which reveals so much of India in the seventeenth century and served Dryden as the basis for his "Aureng-Zebe" will always remain valuable, and it is satisfactory to have it in what should be its definitive English dress.

"The Rise of the Dutch Kingdom, 1795-1813," by Hendrik Willem Van Loon (Doubleday; $2.50 net), embraces a period of Dutch history which has been altogether overshadowed by the infinitely greater world events which were taking place over the border in France. It is a period also of which Dutchmen have no great reason to be proud. It began with the ignoble flight of the Orange Stadholder, William V; and it was filled with a succession of subservient concessions to the increasingly insulting demands of the French. Ichabod! Ichabod! might those well exclaim who remembered the glorious days of William the Silent and William the Third. But out of this humiliation, after Napoleon's defeat at Leipzig, came the restoration of the Orange family in the person of William I as King with wide powers, and the beginning of better days, though it was not until about the year 1870, says the author (p. 259), that there was really "a more hopeful attitude in the point of view of the Dutch nation. Then, at last, it recovered from the blows of the first twelve years of the century. Then it regained the courage of its own individual convictions, and once more was ready to take up the burden of nationality." The author is evidently well acquainted with the facts of his country's history. He has reproduced a number of interesting old prints. He conveys some information and a point of view to one who, like the reviewer, has retained sufficient patience to read the short book through from cover to cover. But his style is offensive, not because he may not be using his mother-tongue, but because of his cheap wit, inappropriate flippancy, and self-conscious attempts at cleverness.

Edward Hutton's "Naples and Southern Italy" (Macmillan; $2 net) shows the familiar characteristics of an accomplished cicerone —an agreeable style, well-proportioned information, a strong Catholic bias. Primarily it is a guide to the antiquities. Here it may be compared with Edward Lear's travels of sixty years ago. The painter had little eye but for the people and scenery. Mr. Hutton affords just about the historical background that an intelligent tourist in these seldom-visited regions will need. It is interesting to learn how the motor omnibus is opening up formerly almost inaccessible routes in Calabria. There are a number of color plates after Frank Crisp's water colors and a few photographic cuts. We note a few slips. Augustus, not Tiberius, built the Capri palaces. Giotto did not paint in the Castel dell' Ovo.

Two interesting books on the machinery of war, which largely supplement each other, are Henry Smith Williams and Edward Huntington Williams's "Modern Warfare" (Hearst's International Library Co.; $2 net), and Hrolf von Dewitz's "War's New Weapons" (Dodd, Mead; $1.50 net). The former of these is a history of the development of the principal tools of war, from the invention of gunpowder up to the present time, with special emphasis upon the weapons that are being used in the great war of our day. The two authors are experienced compilers, one of them being editor-in-chief of the Historians' History of the World, the other an associate editor of the Britannica; and while they make no pretensions here to original research, they have used their various secondary sources with skill. Their aim has been to collect and arrange a number of facts most of which are well known to military men and historians, and to answer the many questions that most laymen want to ask when they read in the newspapers of howitzers and *mitrailleuses*, and when they wonder how a submarine manages to go down and a Zeppelin to go up.

If Dr. Williams deals in facts, Baron von Dewitz gives us facts, fiction, and philosophy. The facts form the bulk of the volume; the fiction is injected in poetical descriptions of imaginary battles used as introductions to the various chapters; and the philosophy is intermingled with the facts and the fiction, and added in unadulterated form in a Preface and an Epilogue. Unlike "Modern Warfare," "War's New Weapons" deals only with the present world conflict, and, being written by a man who (as Mr. Hudson Maxim says in his Preface) "has a masterful knowledge of military tactics and the philosophy of warfare," it presents the reader with a good deal of interesting and useful information. The tone of the book, however, is decidedly different from that of Dr. Williams's handy encyclopædia. For the Baron is not an editor of a History of the World or of the Britannica, but a military man and a philosopher, and he seldom tries to hide his patronizing contempt for the ignorant civilian—and particularly the American civilian—for whose instruction his book is written. Nor is the Baron satisfied with a mere presentation of the facts about war's new weapons. He has, be it remembered, "a masterful knowledge of the philosophy of warfare"; and the moral of the importance of preparedness is ever to the front. Moreover, though the Baron is a subject of Denmark, one of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his principal aims is to set the American public right on the question of Germany's innocence and especially of her all-round superiority. England, to be sure, has a larger navy, but the German submarine has nearly made up for the English Dreadnoughts, and the secret big naval guns and the super-Zeppelins which Germany probably has up her sleeve may yet more than counterbalance the initial advantage of the Allies upon the sea; while in nearly every other kind of war tool, including super-commissariat and super-strategy (and apparently also supermen), Germany is far better supplied than her foes. One exception, however, should be made—namely, the fountain-pen, which as a war weapon in the hands of English and American correspondents has done great deeds for the Allies and has completely misled the American public on many important questions. The book is prefaced by a short sermon by Hudson Maxim, who, taking the whole work as his text, draws the moral in the shape of a terrible picture of this country invaded by an up-to-date army of any number you please, from 100,000 up, equipped with war's new weapons, to which America is able to offer absolutely no effective resistance. Such a picture presents, in Mr. Maxim's view, not a remote possibility, but a very real probability in the near future, unless we rouse ourselves from the valor of ignorance and arm to the teeth at once. For it is his opinion, deliberately expressed, that "whichever side wins [in the present war], the United States will likely have to fight the winner within a short time after the war is over."

Arthur G. Sedgwick, who killed himself in a hotel in Pittsfield, Mass., on July 14, was a New York lawyer and a distinguished critic and had served for several years on the editorial staffs of the *Nation*, the *Evening Post*, and the *American Law Review*. He was the son of Theodore Sedgwick, of New York, and great grandson of Judge Theodore Sedgwick, Speaker of the House of Representatives, 1799-1801. Mr. Sedgwick contributed much to the literature of his profession, editing several editions of Theodore Sedgwick's "Treatise on the Measure of Damages" and collaborating with Frederick S. Wait in a "Treatise on the Trial of Title to Land." In 1908 he was asked to deliver the Godkin lectures at Harvard, which were started in 1903 in memory of Edwin Lawrence Godkin, for many years editor of the *Evening Post* and the *Nation*. Mr. Sedgwick was born in New York on October 6, 1844. He graduated from Harvard in 1864, and from the Law School in 1866. In 1870 his university gave him the honorary degree of Master of Arts. He served in the Civil War. Mr. Sedgwick's connection with the *Nation* began, as he wrote in his contribution to the semi-centennial number only two weeks ago, in 1868, when he contributed weekly letters, while editing the *American Law Review* with Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. In 1872 he came to New York to take up the position of assistant editor of the *Nation*. Nine years later he became an editor of the *Evening Post*. In 1886 Mr. Sedgwick was sent by Secretary Bayard to Paso del Norte and Chihuahua, Mexico, to examine the papers in the Cutting case. During the previous winter he delivered at Lowell Institute a course of lectures on "Lawyers." Mr. Sedgwick was a member of the New York Bar Association and of the Century Association.

Drama

Under the title of "Chief Contemporary Dramatists" (Houghton Mifflin; $2.75 net), Prof. Thomas H. Dickinson has published twenty plays, as representative of the best product of the modern movement in the theatre, by English, Irish, American, German, French, Belgian, Norwegian, Swedish, and Russian writers. In a modest preface he sets forth the somewhat elastic principles which governed his selection and the obvious difficulties attending a task of which the ultimate value and utility must be somewhat doubtful. The modern movement, as he sees it, may be defined roughly as that which is commonly, but not always accurately, ascribed to Ibsen and his disciples. Mr. Dickinson disarms captious criticism by his frank acknowledgment that many students will decline to accept his selection as complete and authoritative. He hints, moreover, that in some cases he has been compelled to subordinate his own opinion to that of the authors concerned. Manifestly he has attempted the impossible. The mass of matter is too great to be sampled fairly within the prescribed limits. It may be readily conceded, however, that he has compiled an interesting and instructive volume for the casual reader, and, in most instances, has exhibited sound judgment. Mr. Dickinson expresses regret, without assigning any reason, for his inability to include any play by Shaw or Barrie, and explains the absence of Ibsen by the fact—which applies, of course, equally to many others—that he could not be fairly represented by a single piece. This last remark would not be valid in the case of St. John Hankin or John Masefield, either of whom could fill profitably the pages alloted to Strindberg. But Mr. Dickinson furnishes a liberal allowance of good reading.

In the preface to his "Theatre of Ideas" (Doran; $1), Henry Arthur Jones, referring to his own experience, seems inclined to adopt the ancient heresy—beloved of most modern managers—that the public and the critics are incapable of appreciating really good plays, and that, therefore, to write or produce them generally results in waste of labor and money. He cannot seriously believe it. The ample success of his own best works is a sufficient refutation. Moreover, the acknowledged masterpieces of drama, adequately interpreted, have always been supported by the masses. Plays of great merit sometimes fail, undoubtedly, but it by no means follows that their failure must be attributed to their virtues. It might be hinted that authors are not always the least fallible judges of the absolute values of their own inventions. Mr. Jones, who is nothing if not self-reliant, would not subscribe to that notion. But on most theatrical subjects he speaks with great authority, and he is a fluent and entertaining writer. Skeptical as he is on some points, and radical on others, he is at heart an essential conservative. His contempt for faddists of all sorts, in and out of the theatre, is infinitely wholesome and refreshing. It is as an apostle of common-sense that he laments the disappearance of true burlesque from the stage. He professes an ambition to revive that form of pungent satire in order to assail the varieties of current humbug, impervious to the lighter shafts of comedy, with the savage strokes of the humorous bludgeon. He is, perhaps, somewhat too fond of that homely weapon. Some of his best work is at times marred by over-emphasis. His burlesque sketch, "The Theatre of Ideas," which he has cast in narrative instead of dramatic form, contains much robust and well-aimed satire, with some humorous illustrations not unworthy of their model; but it would be more effective if it were a little less extravagant. It could be greatly improved by judicious pruning and editing. His plea for the one-act play is timely, and it is to be hoped that he may be encouraged to continue his efforts in this direction. His "The Goal," printed in this volume, was one of the most notable one-act pieces produced in the Princess Theatre, and is in many ways a striking and excellent bit of workmanship. "Her Tongue," described as comedy, but really more akin to farce, tells how a silly woman frightened off a desirable wooer by foolish chatter. Two-thirds of it is admirable, but in the end the designed effect is weakened, if not destroyed, by the undue prolongation and elaboration of a capital comic situation. In his little Cornish tragedy, "Grace Mary," he ventures upon the dangerous expedient, in a modern play, of a speaking apparition. In itself, it is a moving and vigorously written tale. A Puritanical old fisherman exacts from his daughter—to whom he is devoted—an oath that she will neither see nor listen to her drunken, ne'er-do-well lover. The latter, knowing her to be within hearing, vows to devote himself to eternal perdition if she will not come to him. Distracted by conflicting emotions, she dies of a broken heart, but her wraith appears to the frenzied lover and pledges him to reform, promising to rejoin him in the beyond. The piece exhibits literary and technical skill, and is theatrically and emotionally strong.

There is cleverness of an uncommon kind in the half a dozen one-act plays which Percival Wilde has published under the title of "Dawn" (Holt; $1). They are well written and exhibit genuine dramatic instinct, as well as a keen sense of theatrical situation. Moreover, they indicate an excellent inventive faculty, all the plots being ingenious and, in their way, effective. Most of them take unexpected turns, the dramatist evidently having great faith in the efficacy of surprise, which is always a dangerous expedient. The ordinary audience is apt to resent a trick which upsets its calculations. But a device of this sort is not only legitimate, but entirely appropriate, in a purely comic episode like "The Noble Lord," in which one is employed with capital result. In "Playing with Fire," however—a delightful little episode, in itself, in which a young girl tests the sincerity of her lover—the whole apparent meaning and significance of the piece are nullified by a development wholly capricious. In much the same way the title-piece, "Dawn," a thrilling little bit of melodrama of the realistic kind, is weakened at the very last moment by an unexpected and amateurish recourse to the preternatural, which is entirely subversive of the intended effect. The most ambitious play in the book, "The Finger of God," also combines the mystical with the melodramatic, but in more artistic fashion. "The Traitor" is a military and "A House of Cards" a social melodrama. In both the audience is deliberately put upon the wrong track—a sure sign of inexperience—but without serious injury to the climactic situations. As a whole, the plays evince clear and original dramatic capacity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finance

THE WAR AND THE WORLD'S RESERVE OF CAPITAL.

One of the anomalies of the present economic situation was witnessed last week in the American stock and bond markets. After almost uninterrupted weakness during the period between the announcement of the new British war loan and the closing of the subscription lists, prices suddenly recovered simultaneously with the news that the huge sum of $3,000,000,000 had been subscribed by English investors, and would presently be taken from the reserve of investment capital. Yet if the world's resources, available for investment in securities of old or new enterprises, are to be suddenly reduced by so prodigious a sum, it might be supposed that investment markets in general would somehow be affected.

Since the war began, England has raised $4,750,000,000 through Government loans, and Germany $3,500,000,000; Austria $1,200,000,000; France $1,500,000,000; Russia something over $750,000,000. This is a total of $11,750,000,000, irrespective of loans raised by Turkey and Italy in preparation for the war, or of loans issued by neutral governments. Every one knows that the belligerent nations, including England, have shut down firmly on nearly all issues of new securities in their home markets, except in connection with the war. At London, for example, where there were floated, during the first half of 1914, $470,000,000 stocks and bonds outside of Governmental issues, $65,000,000 made up the total for such purposes in the first half of 1915.

But this has not gone far towards protecting the accumulated supplies of capital. The largest amount of new securities ever subscribed in a single year on the English market was the $1,335,000,000 of 1910. The largest ever subscribed in Germany, by the *Frankfurter Zeitung's* figures, was the $800,000,000 of 1909; though the Imperial Secretary of the Interior insisted on a total of $1,035,000,000 for the same year. Clearly, these high records would not go far towards matching the requisitions of the past twelve months. Eight years ago, the French economist, Leroy-Beaulieu, figured out that "the civilized world provides $2,400,000,000 in available capital annually for investment in securities." To the fact that the bankers of the world attempted in 1907 to absorb $3,250,000,000 of such capital—an amount which "the world has not got, and therefore cannot provide"—he largely ascribed the derangement in the money markets of that year.

One is inclined to wonder what the financial expert of 1907 would have said, if somebody had suggested that in place of his estimated available maximum of $2,400,000,000 per annum, five European nations would between them, less than a decade later, ask for nearly $12,000,000,000 in a single year. But a further question naturally brought up is this: If the very much smaller requisitions of 1907 were nevertheless so large as to break down the credit situation, force up money rates to 8 and 10 per cent. in almost every great market, and drive half a dozen countries into a disastrous panic, why is the present vastly larger over-absorption of capital proceeding with so little apparent disturbance?

One answer to the question is, that Leroy-Beaulieu was talking of the world's annual increment of capital, whereas the belligerent Powers to-day are already undoubtedly drawing on the reserves, invested or uninvested, of previous years. Now, the outbreak of war last summer, with all the financial consequences involved in it, came at a moment when, financially speaking, the world was better prepared for it than in very many years. Market values of investment securities had been steadily lowered; the depreciation of the half-dozen years before the war had reduced immensely the requisitions on capital. Ultra-conservatism and cautious husbanding of financial resources had been the absolute rule in Europe, at least since the middle of 1911.

The financial and business community of the United States had thoroughly readjusted itself in the years after 1907, and had continued a policy of only the most cautious expansion, at times when the country's economic situation would ordinarily have warranted an enthusiastic "boom." In further explanation, it will be recognized that every one of the belligerent states had instantly constructed a machinery of emergency credit which still exists, and which utilizes all imaginable facilities of credit, as they are utilized to stop an actual panic at its crisis. How much of a positive influence has been exerted by the increase of more than $3,000,000,000 in the paper circulation of the belligerents, is another doubtful question. To a certain extent, this immense expansion of credit issues by Europe's state banks, in the form of currency, is bound to have the same effect as the issue of Government notes directly from the public treasury. The French Government, for example, has already borrowed something like $1,000,000,000 from the Bank of France, the Bank giving out the proceeds in the form of new circulation.

All things considered, the economic experience of the war to date strongly suggests the extent to which the character of the resultant phenomena in a period of the sort may depend on the circumstances of the time in which the war broke out. Let people who remember 1906 try to imagine what would have been the course of events, if the present war had begun in that year. Or, as concerns our own position, it is interesting to imagine its having begun in a year like 1911, of American harvest failure.

The country's position in the field of international finance could not very well then have been exactly what it is; and it is not easy to conceive of our taking the economic leadership of the world if the war had come nine years ago, with New York enormously involved in a floating debt to Europe, and with all American markets on a top level of speculative inflation. But even these considerations do not answer the question, how long even the conservative hoarding of capital resources, in the past half-dozen years, will serve to meet the requisition of the war, or what sort of process will be involved in the post-bellum reconstruction, if the fighting states should meantime have used up the great part of their reserves of invested capital.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

MISCELLANEOUS.

Butler, H. E., and Owen, A. S. Apulei Apologia sive pro Se de Magia Liber. Oxford University Press.
Leach, H. G. Scandinavia of the Scandinavians. Scribner.
Sharp, B. A Captain of the Vanished Fleet. The Pilgrim Press. 50 cents net.
Steed, H. W. L'Angleterre et la Guerre. Paris, France: Librairie Armand Colin.
Torchiana, H. A. van Coenen. Holland: An Historical Essay. San Francisco: Paul Elder & Co. $1.25 net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

Gray, J. M. M. The Old Faith in the New Day. The Abingdon Press. $1 net.
Halfyard, S. F. Cardinal Truths of the Gospel. Methodist Book Concern. $1 net.
Sheldon, H. C. Studies in Recent Adventism. The Abingdon Press. 50 cents net.
Troward, T. The Creative Process in the Individual. McBride. $1.25 net.
Webb, C. C. J. Studies in the History of Natural Theology. Oxford University Press.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

Burns, C. D. Political Ideals. Their Nature and Development. Oxford University Press.
Edgeworth, F. Y. On the Relations of Political Economy to War. Oxford University Press. 1s. net.
Gerber, G. H. The High Cost of Living. New York Book Co.
Goebel, J. The Recognition Policy of the United States. Vol. LXVI. No. 1. Longmans, Green.
Hadley, A. T. Undercurrents in American Politics. Yale University Press. $1.35 net.
Hsu, M. C. Railway Problems in China. Vol. LXVI. No. 2. Longmans, Green.
Papers and Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Minnesota Academy of Social Sciences. Edited by J. F. Ebersole. By the Society.
Seventieth Annual Report of the Prison Association of New York, 1914. Albany: J. B. Lyon.
The Cry for Justice. Edited by U. Sinclair and J. London. Philadelphia: Winston. $2 net.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Belloc, H. The Elements of the Great War. Hearst's International Library Co. $1.50 net.
Bradby, E. D. The Life of Barnave. Vols. I and II. Oxford University Press. 18s. net.
Collected Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War. Doran. $1 net.
Coupland, R. The War Speeches of William Pitt. Oxford University Press.
Courtney, W. P. Bibliography of Johnson. Oxford Historical and Literary Studies. Vol. 4. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d. net.
Falconer, R. A. The German Tragedy and Its Meaning for Canada. Canada: University of Toronto Press.
Garrod, H. W., and Mowat, R. B. Einhard's Life of Charlemagne. Oxford University Press.
Headlam, J. W. The History of Twelve Days. Scribner.
Martin, L. C. The Works of Henry Vaughan. Vols. I and II. Oxford University Press.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Our eyes are opened to a new, but very different Old Chester. Once again we are stirred by a portrayal of true living, such as we feared survived only in the rich legacy left by Sara Orne Jewett. Humor in its most charming effect, pathos elusive and unforeseen, and a depth of neighborly understanding and insight into humanity."

THE OUTLOOK on DOROTHY CANFIELD'S
HILLSBORO PEOPLE

2nd printing. $1.35 net

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, 34 West 33d Street New York

A Summer Book for Intelligent People

Recreations of a Physician

by **A. Stuart M. Chisholm, M.D.**

8vo. 335 *pages.* $2.00 *net.*

The soundness of the advice Dr. A. Stuart M. Chisholm gives specialists in his book entitled "Recreations of a Physician," that they select avocations for the employment of their leisure hours, is well attested in his own case. Early in his professional life, convinced of the tendency of specialization toward narrowness and mental impoverishment, Dr. Chisholm began to make use of his spare moments in a literary way, and some of the fruit of his avocational work appears in the collection of scholarly and entertaining essays his book contains.—*New York Times.*

The essays serve to show how useful a professional man may be entirely aside from his regular work. They are wholesome, stimulating, amusing, and suggestive.—*Brooklyn Eagle.*

Among others are essays on Specialization, Physicians as Men of Letters, Royal Authors, On Some Translations of Horace, Medicine in the 17th Century, The Picaro in Fiction, etc.

New York G. P. Putnam's Sons London

Studies in History, Economics and Public Law

Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.

THE SOVEREIGN COUNCIL OF NEW FRANCE

A Study in Canadian Constitutional History. By RAYMOND DU BOIS CAHALL, Ph.D., One-time Fellow in Modern European History, Columbia University; Acting Assistant Professor of European History and Government, Miami University. 8vo. Paper Covers. Pp. 274. $2.25.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., Publishers

M. A. B. (Mainly About Books)

An illustrated monthly magazine containing excerpts and specimen illustrations from the best new English Books, literary gossip and authors' photographs. A copy will be sent to you post free for twelve months on receipt of 50 cents.

T. FISHER UNWIN, Ltd.,
1 Adelphi Terrace, London, England

Read
L. M. Montgomery's new "ANNE" book
ANNE OF THE ISLAND
A SEQUEL TO
"ANNE OF GREEN GABLES" *310th thousand*
"ANNE OF AVONLEA" *109th thousand*

"It was a powerful battering ram of law, logic, and fact, and it compromised nowhere; but when he had finished, Haywood's invalid wife, seated in her wheel chair, shook his hand and thanked him for his fairness."

That is C. P. Connolly's description of Senator Borah's argument to the jury in the prosecution of William D. Haywood for murder.

"One can take that illustration for a gauge, and everything Borah has done in public life will fit it to the last notch."

"Borah," the first of a series of "Presidential Possibilities" by C. P. Connolly, appears in the July 31st issue of

5¢ a copy
Collier's
THE NATIONAL WEEKLY
416 West 13th Street, New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED